

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With its network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate" or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" init appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity

The Rules contain language about earthquakes and, on a broader level, they also assume that fracking indeed causes earthquakes. The rules describe a whole series of fracking created earthquake levels of intensity. Why would the state allow any business activity that includes the real possibility of it creating earthquakes when done in an otherwise proper manner – especially in a geography known for major earthquakes? The rules are silent regarding broader concerns regarding how fracking created earthquakes will affect existing earthquake prone communities. There is no mention of scientific review or study of the effect of fracking earthquakes within the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Seismic Zones. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency identifies southern IL with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous”. How does IDNR justify allowing any fracking in these areas when industry best practices say there should be no fracking in seismic zones? Rules define various intensities of fracking caused earthquakes by a color code system. Enforcement doesn’t begin until “yellow light alert”, (a magnitude of at least 3.0 but less than 5.0). This color coding system does not appear to be used by the federal USGS, the federal agency responsible for monitoring earthquakes. Why would IDNR use a system not used nationally? What is the purpose of IDNR’s color coded system and what value does it add to protect citizens who might be affected by said quakes? A fracking site can be responsible for creating up to 4 earthquakes up to a level of 4.9 magnitude WITHOUT a mandatory shut-down order by the state. A 4.9 earthquake is a serious and newsworthy event – (USGS description: “Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rocked noticeably.”) What justification does IDNR to allow this? Mandatory shut-down of a site is based on a patchwork of multiple earthquakes at multiple times with varying intensity. For example, if an earthquake caused by fracking “causes significant damage” or a magnitude of 5.0 or greater the state will shut-down the frack site. A 5.0 earthquake is described by USGS as “Felt by all, many frightened.” The rules use a dangerous, high threshold of earthquake intensity for a mandatory shut-down. The fracking caused earthquake literally has to frighten people or break something before the state will step in. What is the justification for such a high threshold? If a shut-down order is made, the fracking company gets a hearing, the purpose of which is to “mitigate induced seismicity events near the permitted well”. To “mitigate” is to minimize, not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking. As with the overall message of the earthquake rules, the intent appears to not eliminate earthquakes caused by fracking but actually permit them. What does IDNR have to say to justify this? The penalty for failing to attend an earthquake hearing or continuing to frack after causing a serious, reported earthquake is \$50 for a first time violation. The rules define these violations as “Administrative penalties”. This amount is a little less than the cost of a dinner and a movie. Even with 4 or more earthquake violations, the maximum fine is only \$500, arguably an acceptable business expense. How is this justifiable? Will fracking companies be held responsible for all monetary damages caused by earthquakes? If the frack site continues to operate in violation of a state order regarding it creating earthquakes the minimum fine is \$100. Who is making up these ridiculously industryslanted rules? In Act §1-96, the General Assembly orders assigns IDNR to consultation with the Illinois State

Fair Economy Illinois

Geological Survey (ISGS) when devising a protocol to control the operations of Class II injection wells. The "cut points" in it appears that IDNR's did not consult with ISGS or seismologists on their devised "traffic light" control system indicate that IDNR did not consult with ISGS, seismologists or scientific study. It appears that the traffic light system was determined by bureaucratic fiat rather than through scientific reports and experts. We believe Rule 240.796 to be inconsistent and deficient, and the failure to consult with the ISGS results in a rule that (1) limits the scope of the law; (2) will result in uncompensated damages and possibly injury to private and public property holders, as well as possible injury to those residing in the vicinity of an injection well induced earthquake induced by a Class II injection well, and (3) will threaten aquifers with irreversible pollution or diminution of water quality. Points 2 and 3 "constitute a serious threat to the public interest, safety, or welfare" of Illinois citizens and businesses. Public infrastructure and buildings will also face costly and uncompensated damages. The National Academy of Sciences (2013) calls for the creation of a seismograph grid; these monitors to pinpoint the injections wells that has caused an earthquakes. It is self evident that without such a grid (1) the Act §1-96 (a) requirement to attribute a "felt earthquake" to a Class II injection well cannot be met; and (2) as a result, private and public parties will have no legal basis for compensatory relief. There is NO seismograph grid in Southern or Central Illinois and the IDNR has not called for one. Next, the IDNR creates a traffic light system that moves the yellow and red cut points to the right of prevailing expert opinion. For example, IDNR's red light for cessation of injections begins at M5.0 whereas experts place it at M4.0. In effect, IDNR has turned an expert red light into an agency yellow light so that well operators are given administrative permission to "run through red lights." Injection well earthquakes can cause serious damage. A recent example involves the Magnitude 5.7 earthquake in Prague, Oklahoma that destroyed 14 homes and damaged a highway (REFS). With is network of pre-existing, vertical faults and fractures --the outcome of past, "nature-made" earthquakes-- Southern Illinois is a prime candidate for induced seismicity once Class II injection wells pressurize and lubricate these pre-existing faults by injecting large quantities of gas or oilfield waste (flowback and produced water) deep underground. A second, possibly even more serious consequence, involves the possible flow of fluids between Class II injection wells and decommissioned oil wells, and from thence into aquifers and groundwater. 1.) Class II injections re-pressurize the permeable injection zone into which produced water is pumped, often a zone that once produced oil. 2.) This permeable injection zone can contain many well bores from decommissioned, nonproducing oil wells. Most of these wells are "plugged on paper" but they may no longer be plugged in fact. They have been "bathed" for decades in highly corrosive formation waters with chloride counts as high as 250,000 mg/l. This caustic broth can cause cement or casing failure of once adequately plugged wells. 3.) Once a "plugged on paper" well is broached, Class II "injectate " or fugitive brine has a fast path upward where it can then spread through aquifers. Conclusion: Many aquifers in Southern and Central Illinois face the prospect of serious, irreversible damage as a result of the inconsistent, deficient rulemaking in §240.796. In addition, the failure to consult experts at ISGS and elsewhere has the consequence of limiting the scope of the law. Solution: Observe these 5 empirically derived steps posed by Stanford University geophysicist Mark Zoback: (1) Avoid injection into active faults and faults in brittle rock. (2) Formations should be selected for injection (and injection rates should be limited) to minimize pore pressure changes. (3) Local seismic

Fair Economy Illinois

monitoring arrays should be installed when there is a potential for injection to trigger seismicity. (4) Protocols should be established in advance to define how operations will be modified if seismicity is triggered. (5) Operators need to be prepared to reduce injection rates or abandon wells if triggered seismicity poses any hazard.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Bruce Ostidick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground.

Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>

<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground.

Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>

<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground.

Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>

<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground.

Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>

<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See:

<http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1>
<http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Part 240: Seismicity

Section 240.796 Seismicity In subsection (a)

"Applicability", DNR proposes that this rule apply ONLY to Class II injection wells, not to any other. DNR has not proposed any rules for fracking wells. This is insufficient protection of the population in southern Illinois where citizens are at risk of a major earthquake. Southern Illinois sits above two active seismic zones: the New Madrid and the Wabash Valley. There are two distinct earthquake risks: (1) the risks from injection wells inducing earthquakes that would not otherwise occur and (2) the risks of substantial injuries and damages created when the toxic fracking fluid left in the ground, in pipelines, and in wells (injection and otherwise) is let loose as a result of a major earthquake. There are NO rules establishing guidelines for stopping fracking wells in the event of earthquakes, and NO considerations for siting any wells specifically in active seismic zones. That omission is a reckless disregard for the safety of Southern Illinois residents, their property, and the ecology of the region. Furthermore, in light of recent studies (see below), the risk of earthquakes can extend far beyond local areas. See: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/3072> : A new study is the latest to tie a string of unusual earthquakes, in this case, in central Oklahoma, to the injection of wastewater deep underground. Researchers now say that the magnitude 5.7 earthquake near Prague, Okla., on Nov. 6, 2011, may also be the largest ever linked to wastewater injection. Felt as far away as Milwaukee, more than 800 miles away, the quake—the biggest ever recorded in Oklahoma--destroyed 14 homes, buckled a federal highway and left two people injured. <http://geology.gsapubs.org/content/early/2013/03/26/G34045.1> <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3706&from=rss#.UohRF40hRL8> "Why America's Heartland is Earthquake Country", United States Geological Service, September 30, 2013 "Enhanced Remote Earthquake Triggering at Fluid-Injection Sites in the Midwestern United States", Nicholas J. van der Elst et al., DOI: 10.1126/science.1238948, Science 341, 164 (2013).

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

245.100 Applicability Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

245.100 Applicability Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

How, IDNR, do you flout the law passed by the General Assembly? Let me count the ways. As the public agency charged with protecting the environment and the public's health from the dangers of hydraulic fracturing, why would you limit your power to regulate the hydraulic fracturing within the state on purpose? Let me remind you that Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act "applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State." In short, that's ALL the wells and ALL of the activities that occurred there. However, the draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013. Why???? Clearly the obvious necessity of the General Assembly's act and of the subsequent hydraulic fracturing regulations (written by IDNR) are enough proof that unregulated hydraulic fracturing operations pose a risk to the health and safety of Illinois' citizens and the environment. (Why bother writing them if the activity posed no risk?) So again, why would you want to limit the scope of the rules when in fact older wells may require greater regulation given age and lack of regulation regarding their original construction? All hydraulic fracturing companies should report "high volume hydraulic fracturing" activities, regardless of when the activity occurred. IDNR should ensure that all operations, including past operations, comply(idd) with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible, requiring compliance with air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, and other obligations that protect public and environmental health.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

How, IDNR, do you flout the law passed by the General Assembly? Let me count the ways. As the public agency charged with protecting the environment and the public's health from the dangers of hydraulic fracturing, why would you limit your power to regulate the hydraulic fracturing within the state on purpose? Let me remind you that Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act "applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State." In short, that's ALL the wells and ALL of the activities that occurred there. However, the draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013. Why???? Clearly the obvious necessity of the General Assembly's act and of the subsequent hydraulic fracturing regulations (written by IDNR) are enough proof that unregulated hydraulic fracturing operations pose a risk to the health and safety of Illinois' citizens and the environment. (Why bother writing them if the activity posed no risk?) So again, why would you want to limit the scope of the rules when in fact older wells may require greater regulation given age and lack of regulation regarding their original construction? All hydraulic fracturing companies should report "high volume hydraulic fracturing" activities, regardless of when the activity occurred. IDNR should ensure that all operations, including past operations, comply(idd) with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible, requiring compliance with air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, and other obligations that protect public and environmental health.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Bryan Cones Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon 525 South State Street (Apt. 1326) Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

Regulatory Exemption of Fracking Operations Predating the Passage of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.100 Applicability Problem: The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner
Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

The draft rules (Sec. 245.100) apply only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013, while the original regulatory act clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, current, and future wells. Specifically, Section 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. The existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Hence, it makes no sense for IDNR to intentionally limit the scope of the rules to apply only to new fracking operations, while bypassing regulations on old wells. One might even argue that older wells—given both their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction—would merit greater attention from regulatory agencies. Revisions Needed: Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, My name is Rebecca Quesnell and I am twenty years old. Although I have only had twenty years of life I have taken note that a lot of companies, factories, etcetera have been grandfathered into exemptions. I request that this does not occur with already existing hydraulic fracturing sites in Illinois. In the drafted rules released by you, the IDNR, Sec. 245.100 applies only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013. However, the original regulatory act very clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, present, and future hydraulic fracturing wells. More specifically, Sec. 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. It seems to me that the existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Let’s face it, even regulated fracking poses great risks, especially in Southern Illinois given the known fault lines that will be drilled near and that could definitely be triggered by the occurring fracking in the area. Thus, it makes absolutely no sense for the IDNR to INTENTIONALLY limit the scope of the rules to apply to only new fracking operations and, in the process, bypassing regulations for and on old wells! To be completely honest, it is likely that older wells (given their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction) merit even greater attention from regulatory agencies (meaning you!) because of the risk they pose to both peoples’ health and the environment! I just cannot believe that this is yet another loophole that has been created within these proposed rules and regulations. They should not even be called rules and regulations because you are not looking at regulating fracking from every perspective and direction. As a result of this very noticeable loophole (for older frack sites) I urge you to revise this thought process and section of the rules and regulations. I ask that you: 1. Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. 2. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc. Thank you for your time in reading this, and please consider what I have discussed and stop giving loopholes to fracking companies!

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, My name is Rebecca Quesnell and I am twenty years old. Although I have only had twenty years of life I have taken note that a lot of companies, factories, etcetera have been grandfathered into exemptions. I request that this does not occur with already existing hydraulic fracturing sites in Illinois. In the drafted rules released by you, the IDNR, Sec. 245.100 applies only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013. However, the original regulatory act very clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, present, and future hydraulic fracturing wells. More specifically, Sec. 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. It seems to me that the existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Let’s face it, even regulated fracking poses great risks, especially in Southern Illinois given the known fault lines that will be drilled near and that could definitely be triggered by the occurring fracking in the area. Thus, it makes absolutely no sense for the IDNR to INTENTIONALLY limit the scope of the rules to apply to only new fracking operations and, in the process, bypassing regulations for and on old wells! To be completely honest, it is likely that older wells (given their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction) merit even greater attention from regulatory agencies (meaning you!) because of the risk they pose to both peoples’ health and the environment! I just cannot believe that this is yet another loophole that has been created within these proposed rules and regulations. They should not even be called rules and regulations because you are not looking at regulating fracking from every perspective and direction. As a result of this very noticeable loophole (for older frack sites) I urge you to revise this thought process and section of the rules and regulations. I ask that you: 1. Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. 2. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc. Thank you for your time in reading this, and please consider what I have discussed and stop giving loopholes to fracking companies!

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, My name is Rebecca Quesnell and I am twenty years old. Although I have only had twenty years of life I have taken note that a lot of companies, factories, etcetera have been grandfathered into exemptions. I request that this does not occur with already existing hydraulic fracturing sites in Illinois. In the drafted rules released by you, the IDNR, Sec. 245.100 applies only to fracking operations occurring since June 17, 2013. However, the original regulatory act very clearly mandates that the provisions in the act apply to past, present, and future hydraulic fracturing wells. More specifically, Sec. 1-20 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act passed earlier this year states that the Act “applies to all wells where high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations are planned, have occurred, or are occurring in this State”. It seems to me that the existence and presumed necessity of the rules is clear evidence that unregulated fracking poses a significant risk to the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. Let’s face it, even regulated fracking poses great risks, especially in Southern Illinois given the known fault lines that will be drilled near and that could definitely be triggered by the occurring fracking in the area. Thus, it makes absolutely no sense for the IDNR to INTENTIONALLY limit the scope of the rules to apply to only new fracking operations and, in the process, bypassing regulations for and on old wells! To be completely honest, it is likely that older wells (given their age and the lack of regulations at the time of their construction) merit even greater attention from regulatory agencies (meaning you!) because of the risk they pose to both peoples’ health and the environment! I just cannot believe that this is yet another loophole that has been created within these proposed rules and regulations. They should not even be called rules and regulations because you are not looking at regulating fracking from every perspective and direction. As a result of this very noticeable loophole (for older frack sites) I urge you to revise this thought process and section of the rules and regulations. I ask that you: 1. Require all fracking companies to report any prior fracking activities that fall under the definition of “high volume hydraulic fracturing”, regardless of when the activity occurred. 2. Ensure that past operations comply with the regulations outlined by IDNR to the furthest extent possible. For example, while it would not make sense for an operator to go back and re-perform drilling activities that did not conform to the Act, it should require compliance of ongoing obligations mandated by the rules – such as air emissions control requirements associated with production, post-frack testing and reporting, etc. Thank you for your time in reading this, and please consider what I have discussed and stop giving loopholes to fracking companies!

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.100 Applicability

We don't need your trash in our state to kill and laim generations to come.

Sincerely, George Adams 1512 W. Fargo Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

"Affected Patient" Proposed Administrative Rules- Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act The definition of Affected Patient refers to "illness or injury diagnosed by the health care professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." This reference to trade secret chemicals is in direct contradiction to the federal law, Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970. According to this law, workplaces are mandated to post all chemicals that a worker may be exposed to on the job, as well as what to do in the case of exposure. It is imperative that this information be available freely and immediately, and OSHA inspectors will fine an employer for noncompliance. The regulation's treatment of fracking chemicals, many of which are deadly and/or carcinogenic such as benzene and other solvents, as "trade secret" is totally unconscionable and should be struck. When it comes to exposure to toxic chemicals, DNR should be looking out for public safety and not some false notion of private business practices. Your standard cannot violate federal law, please mandate that all fracking chemicals must be explicitly stated- with no provision for redaction of "trade secrets"- and provided not only as part of the initial permit application to DNR and before beginning operation (as specified in 245.700) but on a consistent basis as a matter of essential public knowledge, especially when it comes to health professionals and "affected patients" and to people living in surrounding communities. "Trade secrets" should not be allowed to come before public safety and again, I urge you to remove the provision entirely.

Sincerely, Ivy Czekanski 601 W. Deming Place #502 Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Bruce Osttick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham
Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

According to IDNR's definitions, a "Well site" means surface areas, including the surface location of the well, occupied by all equipment or facilities necessary for, or incidental to, high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations, construction, drilling, production, or plugging a well. (Section 1-5 of the Act) While this definition might be appropriate for a well that drills straight down, as wells once did, it is not appropriate for horizontal hydraulic fracturing wells. Horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations involve an initial drilling site that then grows to include horizontal legs radiating out from the site. Leaks or ruptures, the well's proximity to water sources, and/or to real property are not adequately imagined by the well site definition that underpins so much of the IDNR's approach to these regulations. The well site definition should be expanded to include the surface area above any and all horizontal or vertical legs of the well. The current narrow definition does not adequately protect the health, safety and well-being of Illinois citizens, nor will it adequately sequester water used for human or animal consumption from accidents that can occur anywhere the drilling occurs. A useful way of thinking of a hydraulic fracturing well site would be to compare it to an iceberg, where the small amount of ice visible at the water's surface gives no hint of the size of the area occupied by the iceberg below the water line. The potential surface area that can be detrimentally affected by a hydraulic fracturing operation includes all land within 500, 750, or 1500 feet of a hydraulic fracturing leg (to use the IDNR's own measurements), regardless of the leg's horizontal or vertical relationship to the earth. This definition is critical because setback requirements are based on IDNR's inadequate definition of a well-site when they should, at a minimum, be based on the distance from any part of the well, including all underground horizontal legs of the well. To adopt the current definition of well site is to apply an old understanding about what constitutes a well to an approach to drilling that has grown much more complex. The IDNR needs to reflect its understanding of the inherent and possible dangers of hydraulic fracturing by recognizing that the well site for such an operation has much greater breadth than the current definition envisions.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

As a person who has earned a Bachelors of Science in Biology, I know that aquatic biology is extremely diverse and complex. Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. However, these macroscopic animals are not all that matters when it comes to aquatic and how the health of that life effects the health of nearby humans. For instance, not even a plant definition of aquatic life is included, and yet, without the photosynthesizing members of the aquatic community, macroscopic species such as fish and mussels would be unable to survive. This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

As a person who has earned a Bachelors of Science in Biology, I know that aquatic biology is extremely diverse and complex. Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. However, these macroscopic animals are not all that matters when it comes to aquatic and how the health of that life effects the health of nearby humans. For instance, not even a plant definition of aquatic life is included, and yet, without the photosynthesizing members of the aquatic community, macroscopic species such as fish and mussels would be unable to survive. This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

As a person who has earned a Bachelors of Science in Biology, I know that aquatic biology is extremely diverse and complex. Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. However, these macroscopic animals are not all that matters when it comes to aquatic and how the health of that life effects the health of nearby humans. For instance, not even a plant definition of aquatic life is included, and yet, without the photosynthesizing members of the aquatic community, macroscopic species such as fish and mussels would be unable to survive. This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chiacgo, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Jay Keating 17007 S 82nd Avenue tinley park, IL 60477

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Jill Paulus 1806 Marion Ct Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Mike Reed Box 421 Sheridan, IL 60551

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Nancy Eichelberger 8405 S Ridge Rd Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? This is an inexcusable loophole that makes all Illinois residents vulnerable, both for their health, and their ability to receive treatment. The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Panelli Juliana 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Robert Yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Shelley Brown Decatur, IL 62522

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Shelley Brown Decatur, IL 62522

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Do the people have a voice anymore, or do the elected officials do what they want. Time for all Americans to wake up. If your repr. does not vote the way you want then it is your duty to vote him OUT.

Sincerely, Edward Malewicki 12942 S. Commercial Ave. Chicago, IL 60633

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Do the people have a voice anymore, or do the elected officials do what they want. Time for all Americans to wake up. If your repr. does not vote the way you want then it is your duty to vote him OUT.

Sincerely, Edward Malewicki 12942 S. Commercial Ave. Chicago, IL 60633

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Ecosystem: "An ecosystem is a system which is formed when a community of organisms interacts with the environment. An ecosystem is basically an organism community which interacts with one another and their environment in such a way that energy is transferred between them and system-level processes like the cycle of elements emerge. The ecosystem is the core concept in Ecology and Biology, and serves as the building block of biological organization where organisms interact with each other simultaneously and with the environment as well. Therefore, ecosystems are a step after the ecological community level (in which organisms of different species interact with one another) and are at a stage below or equal to the biosphere and biomes. Essentially, they are regional ecosystems, while the biosphere is larger than all the possible ecosystems." From: <http://www.ecosystem.org> For this reason, it doesn't make any sense that Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules defines "Aquatic life" as all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Such a narrow definition excludes many other species important to an aquatic ecosystem. As can be extrapolated from the definition above, freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, and minerals/gases (e.g. oxygen), for example. Focusing on such an exclusive definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily removes focus from numerous important elements of the larger ecosystem to focus on a few components of the ecosystem. Often other, smaller organisms/ecological changes reflect negative ecological effects of human activities long before the larger creatures in an ecosystem show signs of danger. In other words, the canary dies before the miners do, a la the canary in the mineshaft. IDNR rules must broaden the rules to include "aquatic ecosystems", rather than "aquatic life." Specific scientific standards for the protection of aquatic ecosystems within the rules should include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Ecosystem: "An ecosystem is a system which is formed when a community of organisms interacts with the environment. An ecosystem is basically an organism community which interacts with one another and their environment in such a way that energy is transferred between them and system-level processes like the cycle of elements emerge. The ecosystem is the core concept in Ecology and Biology, and serves as the building block of biological organization where organisms interact with each other simultaneously and with the environment as well. Therefore, ecosystems are a step after the ecological community level (in which organisms of different species interact with one another) and are at a stage below or equal to the biosphere and biomes. Essentially, they are regional ecosystems, while the biosphere is larger than all the possible ecosystems." From: <http://www.ecosystem.org> For this reason, it doesn't make any sense that Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules defines "Aquatic life" as all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Such a narrow definition excludes many other species important to an aquatic ecosystem. As can be extrapolated from the definition above, freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, and minerals/gases (e.g. oxygen), for example. Focusing on such an exclusive definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily removes focus from numerous important elements of the larger ecosystem to focus on a few components of the ecosystem. Often other, smaller organisms/ecological changes reflect negative ecological effects of human activities long before the larger creatures in an ecosystem show signs of danger. In other words, the canary dies before the miners do, a la the canary in the mineshaft. IDNR rules must broaden the rules to include "aquatic ecosystems", rather than "aquatic life." Specific scientific standards for the protection of aquatic ecosystems within the rules should include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Ecosystem: "An ecosystem is a system which is formed when a community of organisms interacts with the environment. An ecosystem is basically an organism community which interacts with one another and their environment in such a way that energy is transferred between them and system-level processes like the cycle of elements emerge. The ecosystem is the core concept in Ecology and Biology, and serves as the building block of biological organization where organisms interact with each other simultaneously and with the environment as well. Therefore, ecosystems are a step after the ecological community level (in which organisms of different species interact with one another) and are at a stage below or equal to the biosphere and biomes. Essentially, they are regional ecosystems, while the biosphere is larger than all the possible ecosystems." From: <http://www.ecosystem.org> For this reason, it doesn't make any sense that Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules defines "Aquatic life" as all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Such a narrow definition excludes many other species important to an aquatic ecosystem. As can be extrapolated from the definition above, freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, and minerals/gases (e.g. oxygen), for example. Focusing on such an exclusive definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily removes focus from numerous important elements of the larger ecosystem to focus on a few components of the ecosystem. Often other, smaller organisms/ecological changes reflect negative ecological effects of human activities long before the larger creatures in an ecosystem show signs of danger. In other words, the canary dies before the miners do, a la the canary in the mineshaft. IDNR rules must broaden the rules to include "aquatic ecosystems", rather than "aquatic life." Specific scientific standards for the protection of aquatic ecosystems within the rules should include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Ecosystem: "An ecosystem is a system which is formed when a community of organisms interacts with the environment. An ecosystem is basically an organism community which interacts with one another and their environment in such a way that energy is transferred between them and system-level processes like the cycle of elements emerge. The ecosystem is the core concept in Ecology and Biology, and serves as the building block of biological organization where organisms interact with each other simultaneously and with the environment as well. Therefore, ecosystems are a step after the ecological community level (in which organisms of different species interact with one another) and are at a stage below or equal to the biosphere and biomes. Essentially, they are regional ecosystems, while the biosphere is larger than all the possible ecosystems." From: <http://www.ecosystem.org> For this reason, it doesn't make any sense that Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules defines "Aquatic life" as all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Such a narrow definition excludes many other species important to an aquatic ecosystem. As can be extrapolated from the definition above, freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, and minerals/gases (e.g. oxygen), for example. Focusing on such an exclusive definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily removes focus from numerous important elements of the larger ecosystem to focus on a few components of the ecosystem. Often other, smaller organisms/ecological changes reflect negative ecological effects of human activities long before the larger creatures in an ecosystem show signs of danger. In other words, the canary dies before the miners do, a la the canary in the mineshaft. IDNR rules must broaden the rules to include "aquatic ecosystems", rather than "aquatic life." Specific scientific standards for the protection of aquatic ecosystems within the rules should include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How are healthcare providers supposed to provide treatment to patients whose lives or health are in danger due to exposure to fracking chemicals when they do not have access to the identities of the chemicals used in the process? Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? With over 350 proprietary chemicals used in the fracking process, using screening tests to determine which chemical is involved in order to determine treatment is not only wasteful of healthcare resources, both in terms of time and money, but also potentially and unnecessarily puts people's lives at risk.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How are healthcare providers supposed to provide treatment to patients whose lives or health are in danger due to exposure to fracking chemicals when they do not have access to the identities of the chemicals used in the process? Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? With over 350 proprietary chemicals used in the fracking process, using screening tests to determine which chemical is involved in order to determine treatment is not only wasteful of healthcare resources, both in terms of time and money, but also potentially and unnecessarily puts people's lives at risk.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How are healthcare providers supposed to provide treatment to patients whose lives or health are in danger due to exposure to fracking chemicals when they do not have access to the identities of the chemicals used in the process? Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? With over 350 proprietary chemicals used in the fracking process, using screening tests to determine which chemical is involved in order to determine treatment is not only wasteful of healthcare resources, both in terms of time and money, but also potentially and unnecessarily puts people's lives at risk.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How are healthcare providers supposed to provide treatment to patients whose lives or health are in danger due to exposure to fracking chemicals when they do not have access to the identities of the chemicals used in the process? Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? With over 350 proprietary chemicals used in the fracking process, using screening tests to determine which chemical is involved in order to determine treatment is not only wasteful of healthcare resources, both in terms of time and money, but also potentially and unnecessarily puts people's lives at risk.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How are healthcare providers supposed to provide treatment to patients whose lives or health are in danger due to exposure to fracking chemicals when they do not have access to the identities of the chemicals used in the process? Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? With over 350 proprietary chemicals used in the fracking process, using screening tests to determine which chemical is involved in order to determine treatment is not only wasteful of healthcare resources, both in terms of time and money, but also potentially and unnecessarily puts people's lives at risk.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How are healthcare providers supposed to provide treatment to patients whose lives or health are in danger due to exposure to fracking chemicals when they do not have access to the identities of the chemicals used in the process? IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." The problem is that in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? With over 350 proprietary chemicals used in the fracking process, using screening tests to determine which chemical is involved in order to determine treatment is not only wasteful of healthcare resources, both in terms of time and money, but also potentially and unnecessarily puts people's lives at risk. Chemicals should automatically be disclosed to healthcare providers so that they know what to test for if they suspect exposure to a chemical involved in hydraulic fracturing. A physician should not have to identify that an individual has been exposed to a fracking chemical before the chemicals are disclosed to him. The whole idea here is absurd.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How can out state put the drilling company's "trade secrets" ahead of the physician's ability to diagnose and treat a patient? Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. Source: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html>

Sincerely, Jan A Pietrzak 12031 S 72nd Ct Palos Heights, IL 60463

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How can physicans deal with a patient when the doctors do not know what chemicals are involved in the illness? The risk to the patient in the emergency room and those others who live there are far too high.

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

How is my doctor supposed to diagnose what is wrong with me if I have health problems as a result of hydraulic fracking if she doesn't know what poisons (a.k.a proprietary trade secret chemicals) are being used in the process? If you are protecting the health of the citizens of this state we have the right to know what is being introduced into our immediate environment via our air and water. What are these mystery chemicals that are used in fracking? Why can't they be revealed to the public, to first responders, and to health care professionals?

Sincerely, Sherry Sullivan Goreville, IL 62939

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

i agree with the proposed changes above.

Sincerely, Amy Coffman Phillips 418 WEST FRANKLIN AVE Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

I am a resident of Jackson County living on a piece of land that was once owned by a coal company. I am also very sensitive to volatile organic compounds which trigger awful asthma attacks. The rules protecting the trade secrets of these caustic chemicals in the fracking process have a strong potential for damaging my health. Over the years, I've witnessed mine subsidence all over Southern IL and we are also sitting smack dab on the New Madrid fault. Currently, the Big Muddy is at Flood stage and a week ago, torrential rain fall happened with flash flooding. What I don't see are meaningful penalties or any decision makers with addresses in the lower 17 counties of IL where fracking is most likely to occur. You need a native on that board who knows about the mine subsidence down state. You need the voice of down state residents who have homes and health directly affected by fracking.

Sincerely, Paula Cade 213 Janet Lane Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

I am very concerned about the possible health affects of the "trade secret" chemicals that are used in hydraulic fracturing. As a mom, I don't want to face the possible future situation where my child is sick and we do not know what he has been exposed to-- right in our own well-water or stream! It seems impossible that in the USA, where we pride ourselves on freedom of information (among other freedoms) that we cannot know what chemicals are being injected into the ground right under our feet! Please, please do not allow these mystery chemicals to be injected with no further information. The public has a right to know what chemicals are being used.

Sincerely, Leslie Duram Makanda, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

I do not want fracking in my area. Oil & gas companies lie and help themselves to enormous quantities of fresh water. They bribe politicians. They pollute. They are indifferent to America but love taking its resources. They love money. Please stop them.

Sincerely, Evan Kroeker 35 Hillcrest Dr. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

I grew up in eastern Kansas before moving to Illinois. One of my dearest childhood memories is the unencumbered view from my back porch--wheat fields broken up by trees clustered around the occasional stream for as far as the eye can see. My grandparents lived not too far from where we lived. I loved working in my grandmother's garden. She prided herself on her roses and her asparagus bed. We played tag in her backyard with all of the neighbor kids, and at the end of a long round of play, my grandfather would make homemade ice cream or my grandmother would bring out lemonade. For the fourth of July, my grandparents would buy \$300 worth of fireworks, which we would light in the yard. When the fireworks weren't there to entertain us, we would chase fireflies. Imagine how this all would have changed if a well rig suddenly appeared in our back yard? Or if a well bore malfunctioned and poisoned the land on which my grandparents lived, killing her roses and asparagus? What if it appeared in my backyard, where I sled down into the field behind the house? How would that have affected my childhood? Would you let your children run around a well rig? Would you put your children at risk for polluted food and water? Wouldn't you want a choice in the matter? While I now have lived in Illinois for more than 15 years, I can't imagine giving up those memories. Even when I lived in Senegal as a Peace Corps volunteer, I looked out onto the savannah and thought fondly of my childhood in Kansas. This is why I can't understand why IDNR would propose rules do not require a permit applicant to demonstrate having acquired the property-owner's consent to drill a vertical well in a proposed location. Just as equally bizarre, rules do not require a permit applicant to demonstrate having acquired consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled. The rules don't even require notice to these property owners. Section 245.110 of IDNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current Illinois property law. The proposed rules create an entirely new legal term called "real property surface interest," which flouts Illinois law. According to Illinois law, even when the property owner no longer maintains mineral rights, he or she does not necessarily forgo all rights to the subsurface. Secondly, the concept of "real property surface interest" narrows the concept of property owner to simply the surface (as opposed to the term owner of real property" used in Illinois law), excluding the idea that a property owner owns the surface AND subsurface and also excluding the idea that any property owner controls interest in the subsurface. IDNR's rules should be revised by deleting the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. In addition, Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B) should be revised to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Lastly, Section 245.250(a)(1)(A) should be revised to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

I grew up in eastern Kansas before moving to Illinois. One of my dearest childhood memories is the unencumbered view from my back porch--wheat fields broken up by trees clustered around the occasional stream for as far as the eye can see. My grandparents lived not too far from where we lived. I loved working in my grandmother's garden. She prided herself on her roses and her asparagus bed. We played tag in her backyard with all of the neighbor kids, and at the end of a long round of play, my grandfather would make homemade ice cream or my grandmother would bring out lemonade. For the fourth of July, my grandparents would buy \$300 worth of fireworks, which we would light in the yard. When the fireworks weren't there to entertain us, we would chase fireflies. Imagine how this all would have changed if a well rig suddenly appeared in our back yard? Or if a well bore malfunctioned and poisoned the land on which my grandparents lived, killing her roses and asparagus? What if it appeared in my backyard, where I sled down into the field behind the house? How would that have affected my childhood? Would you let your children run around a well rig? Would you put your children at risk for polluted food and water? Wouldn't you want a choice in the matter? While I now have lived in Illinois for more than 15 years, I can't imagine giving up those memories. Even when I lived in Senegal as a Peace Corps volunteer, I looked out onto the savannah and thought fondly of my childhood in Kansas. This is why I can't understand why IDNR would propose rules do not require a permit applicant to demonstrate having acquired the property-owner's consent to drill a vertical well in a proposed location. Just as equally bizarre, rules do not require a permit applicant to demonstrate having acquired consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled. The rules don't even require notice to these property owners. Section 245.110 of IDNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current Illinois property law. The proposed rules create an entirely new legal term called "real property surface interest," which flouts Illinois law. According to Illinois law, even when the property owner no longer maintains mineral rights, he or she does not necessarily forgo all rights to the subsurface. Secondly, the concept of "real property surface interest" narrows the concept of property owner to simply the surface (as opposed to the term owner of real property" used in Illinois law), excluding the idea that a property owner owns the surface AND subsurface and also excluding the idea that any property owner controls interest in the subsurface. IDNR's rules should be revised by deleting the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. In addition, Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B) should be revised to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Lastly, Section 245.250(a)(1)(A) should be revised to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR Definition of "Affected Patient" How does this affect me: Health and well-being Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.110 Definitions Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR Definition of "Affected Patient" How does this affect me: Health and well-being Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.110 Definitions Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor.

Sincerely, Brandon Davis Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! Picture here: <http://blog.skytruth.org/2012/06/meet-frack-family.html> image: The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor.

Sincerely, Ifeanyi Ndukwu Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor.

Sincerely, Ifeanyi Ndukwu Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor.

Sincerely, Jazmine Povlick Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

iDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, TX 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, TX 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Let's illustrate the amount of chemicals we are discussing here. After all, a picture is worth a thousand words! " The imaginary Frack Family at their Beaver County home, showing off the 757 barrels of chemicals used to frack the well near their house - including 373 barrels of "mystery" chemicals. "

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for?

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Currently, horizontal hydraulic fracturing is exempt from the Clean Water Act (among other environmental safe guards) the companies involved do not have to disclose to the public (or anyone) what chemicals they are using. So, they don't. Why is this? Clearly, because they have a lot to hide.

Sincerely, Tyler Hansen 147 Harrison St Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

It is irresponsible for planners of the state to consider allowing fracking in areas that are prone to tornadoes, without creating adequate rules that will protect citizens from the toxic flow back water. It is not safe to allow gas companies to frack in Illinois. Not only are these companies destroying fresh, drinking water in a world that continues to lack access to drinking water, but they haven't even established proper means to ensure that this toxic flow back water is stored properly to prevent contaminations. The possibilities of this toxic water being out in the open in a land prone to tornadoes - where debris from tornadoes are found over 150 miles from where the tornado is - are disastrous and dangerous to all Illinois residents. I urge you to please reconsider allowing fracking in our state. It is unsafe and dangerous to our health and environment.

Sincerely, Carolyn Brunsen Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

It is irresponsible for planners of the state to consider allowing fracking in areas that are prone to tornadoes, without creating adequate rules that will protect citizens from the toxic flow back water. It is not safe to allow gas companies to frack in Illinois. Not only are these companies destroying fresh, drinking water in a world that continues to lack access to drinking water, but they haven't even established proper means to ensure that this toxic flow back water is stored properly to prevent contaminations. The possibilities of this toxic water being out in the open in a land prone to tornadoes - where debris from tornadoes are found over 150 miles from where the tornado is - are disastrous and dangerous to all Illinois residents. I urge you to please reconsider allowing fracking in our state. It is unsafe and dangerous to our health and environment.

Sincerely, Carolyn Brunsen Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

It's directly dangerous to the health of Illinois citizens to allow fracking close to their homes. There have been recorded health problems in every single state where fracking has taken place so far, and these are huge health problems we're talking about. There are cancers and chronic headaches and nosebleeds. People are getting cancer just from living in their homes. They've lived there for years without any problems, but within a few months of the gas companies coming in and setting up fracking wells they have huge, expensive, incurable health problems. These problems can drive families out of their homes. Do you really intend to give the gas companies more of a right to citizen's homes than the families that have lived there for years? It is irresponsible to allow fracking in Illinois, when we know how dangerous the process is. I urge you to stop this before you put citizens at risk.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker 2007 S BLUE ISLAND AVE APT 3F CHICAGO, IL 606082928

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

It's directly dangerous to the health of Illinois citizens to allow fracking close to their homes. There have been recorded health problems in every single state where fracking has taken place so far, and these are huge health problems we're talking about. There are cancers and chronic headaches and nosebleeds. People are getting cancer just from living in their homes. They've lived there for years without any problems, but within a few months of the gas companies coming in and setting up fracking wells they have huge, expensive, incurable health problems. These problems can drive families out of their homes. Do you really intend to give the gas companies more of a right to citizen's homes than the families that have lived there for years? It is irresponsible to allow fracking in Illinois, when we know how dangerous the process is. I urge you to stop this before you put citizens at risk.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker 2007 S BLUE ISLAND AVE APT 3F CHICAGO, IL 606082928

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

It's directly dangerous to the health of Illinois citizens to allow fracking close to their homes. There have been recorded health problems in every single state where fracking has taken place so far, and these are huge health problems we're talking about. There are cancers and chronic headaches and nosebleeds. People are getting cancer just from living in their homes. They've lived there for years without any problems, but within a few months of the gas companies coming in and setting up fracking wells they have huge, expensive, incurable health problems. These problems can drive families out of their homes. Do you really intend to give the gas companies more of a right to citizen's homes than the families that have lived there for years? It is irresponsible to allow fracking in Illinois, when we know how dangerous the process is. I urge you to stop this before you put citizens at risk.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker 2007 S BLUE ISLAND AVE APT 3F CHICAGO, IL 606082928

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:

<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>

<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/IL-Tornadoes-13-1995.png> A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Grace Pai 1350 E. 53rd St. Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Oil companies and money should not trump common sense. Just by looking at the disaster it has caused in other states that have longer history with fracking. The consequences are dire on water, soil contamination and the quality of family life on people who have few options after the fact of fracking. DNR will not ever have enough resources to police this industry and any tax advantage will never replace the earth you destroy.

Sincerely, Sue Walton 2508 Millcreek Lane Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.110 Definitions Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. Of the 1000 barrels of fracking chemicals used on a site, 350 will be "mystery barrels" due to the trade secrets law. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Full disclosure of chemicals used at a site must be available to physicians upon request. Trade secret rules must not trump public safety.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.110 Definitions Comment: IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." PROBLEM – This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. Of the 1000 barrels of fracking chemicals used on a site, 350 will be "mystery barrels" due to the trade secrets law. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? Full disclosure of chemicals used at a site must be available to physicians upon request. Trade secret rules must not trump public safety.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Rules Deprive Property Owners of Their Property Rights Without Notice and Without Compensation

How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law.

Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Rules Deprive Property Owners of Their Property Rights Without Notice and Without Compensation
Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

245.110 Definitions The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: 1.The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. 2.The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. 3.In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: 1.Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. 2.Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. 3.Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Rules Deprive Property Owners of Their Property Rights Without Notice and Without Compensation
Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

245.110 Definitions The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: 1.The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. 2.The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. 3.In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: 1.Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. 2.Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. 3.Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: * This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. * Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: * Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. * By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. * It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: * The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". * Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra 1515 E 54th St #4 Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1. This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1. Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky 5748 S Blackstone Ave Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources,

and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto 1215 E Hyde Park Blvd, Apt 107 Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1. This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1. Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas 1414 E. 59th Street Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand 5844 S Harper Ave Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter 5107 S Blackstone Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sam Zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sam Zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, William Thomas 1414 E 59th St, Room 471 Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor 1414 E. 59th Street Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:

“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: 1.

This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. 2. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants),

micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: 1.

Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the

larger ecosystem that sustains it. 2. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. 3. It neglects the biological criteria

for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: 1. The definition of “aquatic life” must be

broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. 2. Specific scientific standards must be developed to

include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor 1414 E. 59th Street Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is extremely narrow and does not include many other plant, animal and micro-organism species that are important to an aquatic ecosystem. Might one also want to include shorebirds, mammals and insects? Illinois' waterways form a migratory path for Canadian Geese and various ducks for instance, another management area of IDNR, one would have thought. Alterations in water quality impacts plants (and sometimes oxygenation), and then the rest of the system. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Additionally, the soils and geology around an aquatic ecosystem factor into the water chemistry and quality, and the life in it. Toxic substances, alterations in the terrain, temperature, climate, are additional variables. The issue: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" overlooks or ignores the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs, pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification. Examples of research regarding aquatic life and hydraulic fracturing:
<http://www.chec.pitt.edu/documents/Marcellus%20Shale/MarcellusShale-EffectsAquaticLife.pdf>
<http://www.caryinstitute.org/discover-ecology/science-management-forums/hydrofrackingfocus-what-every-citizen-needs-know> <http://www.fws.gov/southeast/news/2013/053.html>
<http://catskillcitizens.org/learnmore/HF-04-Environment-Ecology.pdf>
<http://water.usgs.gov/owq/topics.html#frac>
<http://www.wildlifearkansas.com/proposals/2012PreProposals/Assessment%20of%20a%20riparian%20obligate%20songbird.pdf> <http://www.redorbit.com/news/science/1112964742/radioactive-shale-gas-contaminants-found-at-wastewater-discharge-site/>

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:
“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it.

Sincerely,

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud 1623 E. 55th St. #2 Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud 1623 E. 55th St. #2 Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S. Kenwood Ave. Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Jan A Pietrzak 12031 S 72nd Ct Palos Heights, IL 60463

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Burton Judson Hall, 1005 E 60th St (Room 629B) Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, NY 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, NY 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, NY 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner 5748 S Blackstone Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner 5748 S Blackstone Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan 5454 S Ingleside Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan 5454 S Ingleside Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra 5630 S. University Ave. Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra 5630 S. University Ave. Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra 5630 S. University Ave. Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Tim Brooks Chicago, IL 60652

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Tim Brooks Chicago, IL 60652

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Tyler Hansen Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: “Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna (animals), but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of “aquatic life” unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. Revisions Needed: The definition of “aquatic life” must be broadened to include “aquatic ecosystems”. Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification

Sincerely, M Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: "Aquatic life" means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. Problems with this section: This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example. Why these are problems: Exclusively focusing on a limited definition of "aquatic life" unnecessarily narrows the impact to the larger ecosystem that sustains it. By the time a fish kill occurs pollution caused by fracking will have reached a critical stage, causing havoc across the larger ecosystem. It neglects the biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life. Revisions Needed: The definition of "aquatic life" must be broadened to include "aquatic ecosystems". Specific scientific standards must be developed to include: a) Biological standards, b) High quality water resources, c) Modified or limited water resources, and d) Stressor identification.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states:
“Aquatic life” means all fish, reptiles, amphibians, crayfish, and mussels. This definition is too narrow and does not include many other species that may be important to an aquatic ecosystem. Aquatic life cannot be understood apart from the larger aquatic ecosystem which sustains it. Freshwater ecosystems (limnology) not only include fauna, but also flora (plants), micro/macro invertebrates, oxygen levels and algae, for example.

Sincerely, Oscar Obed Ramirez 4414 N Christiana Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 With the dying loons effected by botulism from the Goby fish, I believe more stress on the ecology of the Great Lake watersheds could threaten our drinking water, recreational fishing and hunting as well as disrupt bird migrations. This language is too limited and when fracking produces fish kills it will be too late, creating havoc on the larger ecosystem. The definition of aquatic life must include aquatic ecosystems to provide regulatory direction to keep our lakes and rivers viable. We cannot support one industry over the ruination of others - tourism etc. to say nothing of viable drinking water and the irrigation for farmlands.

Sincerely, Katharine 3240 N Lakeshore Dr (Apt 15 B) Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Section 245.110 With the dying loons effected by botulism from the Goby fish, I believe more stress on the ecology of the Great Lake watersheds could threaten our drinking water, recreational fishing and hunting as well as disrupt bird migrations. This language is too limited and when fracking produces fish kills it will be too late, creating havoc on the larger ecosystem. The definition of aquatic life must include aquatic ecosystems to provide regulatory direction to keep our lakes and rivers viable. We cannot support one industry over the ruination of others - tourism etc. to say nothing of viable drinking water and the irrigation for farmlands.

Sincerely, Katharine 3240 N Lakeshore Dr (Apt 15 B) Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) 245.110 Definitions The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) 245.110 Definitions The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Brendan F. Houlihan 12217 S. 68th Ct. Palos Heights,, IL 60463-1607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) 245.110 Definitions The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Brendan F. Houlihan 12217 S. 68th Ct. Palos Heights,, IL 60463-1607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) 245.110 Definitions The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) 245.110 Definitions The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The "game" of proposing wording defining an "Affected Patient" as someone who has certain chemicals in their body, but not requiring fracking companies to declare which chemicals are being used, is not only dishonorable, but criminal.

Sincerely, Lana May 300 S. Edward St. Mount Prospect, IL 60056-3418

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The "game" of proposing wording defining an "Affected Patient" as someone who has certain chemicals in their body, but not requiring fracking companies to declare which chemicals are being used, is not only dishonorable, but criminal.

Sincerely, Lana May 300 S. Edward St. Mount Prospect, IL 60056-3418

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The burden of effort to learn the composition of chemicals that workers and the public are exposed to should not be placed on the physician, and especially not in a medical emergency. The information should be readily available 24 hours 7 days a week via existing poison control centers or an easily accessible clearinghouse set up for this purpose. This information should be accessible to the public in lay language. Please review the comments of Dr. Linda Forst, Director, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Division, University of Illinois at Chicago, School of Public Health, at the hearing on November 26, 2013 in Chicago. She has described the issues and the remedies in detail.

Sincerely, Marsha Love Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The burden of effort to learn the composition of chemicals that workers and the public are exposed to should not be placed on the physician, and especially not in a medical emergency. The information should be readily available 24 hours 7 days a week via existing poison control centers or an easily accessible clearinghouse set up for this purpose. This information should be accessible to the public in lay language. Please review the comments of Dr. Linda Forst, Director, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Division, University of Illinois at Chicago, School of Public Health, at the hearing on November 26, 2013 in Chicago. She has described the issues and the remedies in detail.

Sincerely, Marsha Love Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The Department has not adequately specified how it will address those types of hydraulic fracturing operations in which water is not the base fluid or not the only base fluid – for example, fracturing operations using nitrogen or carbon dioxide (gas fracks) or fracturing that uses mixtures of gas and water (e.g. foam fracks, mist fracks). There are several issues that must be addressed. One issue is that the law defines the applicability threshold using gallons of base fluid. Gallons are unit of volume used to measure liquids. As such, it is not clear how the applicability threshold should be calculated for base fluids that are gases, or mixtures of gas and liquid. The situation is complicated by the fact that nitrogen used in fracturing is typically transported as a liquid but injected as a gas. The concern is that, if non-water base fluids are accounted for as liquid gallons, the gallonage total will fall below the applicability thresholds, even though the fracturing job is comparable in scale – and therefore risk – to a water-based frack in terms of chemical use, pressures, or other measures. We note, in this regard, that although the legislature provided no scientific support for the selection of the chosen threshold numbers and did not explain the origin of these numbers, we have surmised that the origin of the 80,000 gallons per stage and 300,000 gallons total thresholds are likely derived (albeit not entirely accurately in the case of the 80,000 gallons) from New York’s proposed regulations. However, New York derived these thresholds from a very limited analysis of volumes of base fluid used in water-based fracturing – not gas-based fracturing. Thus, the Department needs to come up with an appropriate means to express the threshold of applicability as it applies to non-water fracks. The key parameter for developing a comparable threshold should be identifying comparable risk. Addressing the problem by simply converting the water-based thresholds from gallons to cubic feet or another unit of volume appropriate to measure gases is not scientifically sound and does not sufficiently manage risk. A threshold derived in this way would be completely arbitrary and wholly divorced from the real environmental and health risks posed by such non-water fracks. Thresholds for gas-based fracks must be developed independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data from gas-based fracks. The rules must also specify whether the threshold volume for nitrogen, carbon dioxide, or other non-water base fluids applies to the liquid or gas phase of those fluids. For example: 1 million scf of nitrogen gas ~ 7,480,519 gallons of nitrogen gas ~ 10,739 gallons of liquid nitrogen. Specifying the phase on which the threshold volume is based is necessary to prevent creative accounting. This issue is not merely academic - both gas and foam fracks are routinely used in the New Albany Shale (NAS) and in fact may be more successful and more widely used than waterbased fracturing due to the unique properties of the formation.¹ For example, a NAS well in Christian County, KY was stimulated with a gas fracture treatment using approximately 1 million standard cubic feet (scf) of nitrogen gas per stage for eight stages, for a total of approximately 8 million scf of nitrogen gas. Two wells in McLean County, KY were stimulated with mist fracture treatments composed of 92% to 99% nitrogen gas and 8% to 1 % water, using approximately 2 million scf of nitrogen gas per stage for nine stages, for a total of approximately 18 million scf of nitrogen gas per well. The proposed regulations provide no guidance as to how the 80,000 gallon/stage and 300,000 gallon

Fair Economy Illinois

total thresholds should be applied to these gas-based fracturing jobs. The ramifications of this are disastrous, since it is possible to frack dolomite for oil using less than 300K base fluid, there is a strong financial inducement to do so since the excise tax then drops from +3% to 1/10 of 1% and the permit fee from \$13,500 to \$250. Furthermore according to Section 1-5 of the Act, "'Horizontal well' means a well with a wellbore drilled laterally at an angle of at least 80 degrees to the vertical." The Illinois Basin slopes upward as one moves north and west. Since toe up lateral wells will probably be common in shale gas nitrofracks (drainage problems in shallow, underpressurized wells), all that one may need to do is point the toe to the north, which is what geology dictates, and that well may be less than 80 degrees to the lateral. Even if the nitrogen issue is resolved we could still find a lot of gas fracks escaping regulations and frack taxes. Also, the phrase "fracturing fluid and proppant" may cause us problems because a 100% nitrofrack does not use proppant. Or, will the and conjunction be taken literally? Revisions needed: IDNR must come up with a scientifically sound method of determining thresholds for non-water fracks that is independently based on an evaluation of risk and field data. Otherwise, IDNR risks letting off the vast majority of wells from regulation altogether.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The fines are ridiculously low for the fracking companies.

Sincerely, Retha Daugherty Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The issue of aquatic ecosystems is of concern to me since my family and I are neighbors to a federally protected stream in the Shawnee National Forest that is near areas proposed to be fracked.

Sincerely, Craig Rhodes 3883 Mt. Pleasant Rd. Brookport, IL 62910

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The issue of aquatic ecosystems is of concern to me since my family and I are neighbors to a federally protected stream in the Shawnee National Forest that is near areas proposed to be fracked.

Sincerely, Craig Rhodes 3883 Mt. Pleasant Rd. Brookport, IL 62910

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The risks to our water is greater than the benefit of fracking. The use of toxic chemicals makes this procedure not worth doing! Protect what we have now. It will cost much more to clean it up than what we are getting out of it. The cleanup may not even be possible to do at all. After all.....the state is broke!!!

Sincerely, Cynthia Bonnet Lena, IL 61048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. So what happens when their wells become so contaminated that they are a danger to all living beings? Who will compensate them, then??

Sincerely, Sandra /grusji 1112 N. Yale Villa Parkq, IL 60181

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Alan H Kwit 2216 Black Oak Ct Lisle, IL 60532

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Andrew Hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Armin Balli 6109 N. Damen Ave. Apt. 4c Chicago, IL 60659

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Armin Balli 6109 N. Damen Ave. Apt. 4c Chicago, IL 60659

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bethany Ransom Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostidick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, C. Wilcox Bull Valley, IL 60050-7503

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: 1.The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. 2.The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. 3.In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: 1.Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. 2.Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. 3.Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Carrie Landreth Lake in the Hills, IL 60156

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: 1.The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. 2.The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. 3.In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: 1.Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. 2.Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. 3.Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Carrie Landreth Lake in the Hills, IL 60156

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: 1.The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. 2.The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. 3.In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: 1.Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. 2.Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. 3.Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Carrie Landreth Lake in the Hills, IL 60156

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford
chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Janet Elizabeth Donoghue 5082 Springer Ridge Rd Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mary Mathews Lake Forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mary Mathews Lake Forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mary Mathews Lake Forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nancy Eichelberger 8405 S Ridge Rd Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rachele Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rachele Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sarah Cebulak Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Tim Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit-application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

The rules unconstitutionally deprive many property owners of their property without notice and without compensation--thus, without due process of law. Under Illinois law, a person who owns the full bundle of rights in land owns the surface and all that is below it. So, when a landowner owns the full bundle of rights in the land, any drilling on, under, or without the landowner's consent is an illegal trespass and an unconstitutional taking. Similarly, any access to the surface without the landowner's consent is a trespass. The proposed rules would allow a trespass and a deprivation of property without due process of law, more specifically as follows: The rules not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the surface on which the vertical well will be drilled. The rules do not require a permit applicant to show that it has obtained the consent of the owners of the subsurface property through which the horizontal leg of the well will be drilled, nor even require notice to those property owners. In Section 245.110, DNR's proposed rules redefine real property rights in a manner inconsistent with current law. Specifically, the proposed rules would create an entirely new definition--"real property surface interest"--that is inconsistent with Illinois law in at least two respects. First, even when mineral rights are severed, the surface owner does not typically relinquish all rights in the subsurface. Second, the new definition narrows the intent of the law because the law uses the term "owner of real property" while the DNR's new definition excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with the subsurface and also excludes any property owner who owns the surface along with a controlling interest in the subsurface. Revisions Required: Delete the definition of "real property surface interest" in Section 245.110. Revise Section 245.210(A)(16)(A) & (B), on permit application requirements, to require that the applicant show that it has obtained the consent of all the owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled. Revise Section 245.250(a)(1)(A), on public-notice requirements for permit applications, to require that permit applicants personally notify all owners of real property on which, under which, or through which the vertical and horizontal wells are to be drilled.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

This comment relates to the definition of aquatic life in 245.110. This definition is too narrow. It does not include macro and micro invertebrates which often form the basis of the food chain for aquatic vertebrates like fish. Damage to invertebrate populations can reverberate throughout the aquatic ecosystem, so these species must also be protected in the regs. Oxygen and algae levels, as well as aquatic plant populations should also be included in the definition. In addition, it would be helpful if the regs specified the overall health of aquatic ecosystems in areas where fracking is taking place must be maintained by ongoing reviews of current indicators of quality of aquatic ecosystems.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

This disgusting! I don't know how anyone who agrees with this can sleep at night! Please revisit this definition and rewrite it so that it genuinely is helping the American public...not harming them further. Thank you.

Sincerely, Marnelle Curtis Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

This disgusting! I don't know how anyone who agrees with this can sleep at night! Please revisit this definition and rewrite it so that it genuinely is helping the American public...not harming them further. Thank you.

Sincerely, Marnelle Curtis Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Tom Baker here, Chicago, and that this is even an issue suggests how public authority is pushed by private profit seeking interests who eschew the public interests for health and well-being. IDNR, with responsibility first to the public, people, the families, the children, with responsibility to regulate and guide conduct and operations of utilities must not permit "fracking", period. Numerous studies and testimony from people experiencing the consequences of fracking should be testimony enough. And, no, the industry has not engineered a way for this ridiculous procedure to be safe. Why is it even considered We would find it encouraging should the IDNR compel development of alternative methods. Fracking, NO Study and development of alternatives, YES.

Sincerely, Thomas Baker Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

Trade Secret Disclosure to Health Professionals Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets (245.700-245.730) 245.730 Trade Secret Disclosure to Health Professional The proposed language concerning disclosure of trade secret-protected information to health professionals is neither consistent with the statute nor protective of the public. Right to Know. Section 1-77(l) of the Act is clear that information shall be provided, as needed, to health professionals who demonstrate a need for it. Yet, section 245.730 of the Rules diminishes the language of the Act, stating only that the Department “may” provide information to health professionals who demonstrate a need for it. Limitation to “normal business hours.” Subsection 245.730(b)(1) of the Rules states, in the event of an emergency, that a health professional may call the Department during “normal business hours.” For an emergency that occurs after hours, the Rules suggest calling the trade secret holder. This is inadequate. The Department should provide a 24- hour hotline for emergency calls pursuant to this section. “Trade Secret Holder.” Subsection 245.730(b)(2) of the Rules allows a health professional to seek the necessary information from a “trade secret holder,” but there is no means provided for the health professional to know who the trade secret holder is, or what phone number to use to reach it. Furthermore, this provision is found nowhere in the statute, seemingly adding another unnecessary burden on the health professional. Lack of a time limit for the Department’s response. The Department should abide by the same 3-hour time limit for a response that applies to trade secret holders pursuant to 245.730(b)(2).

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions

Section 245.110 Definitions

What happens when we have a tornado or a super cell storm or another derecho. There are insufficient plans in place to cover flooding, etc., as happened in Colorado.

Sincerely, Retha Daugherty Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner
Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in reference to Page 3, Paragraph 6 of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, which states: "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". Simply put, the State of Illinois cannot have sound regulation without good data. There is significant need for further study of horizontal hydraulic fracturing technology prior to its use in the State of Illinois. If the technology was as safe as the industry is claiming, why do there continue to be so many accidents and violations in states where fracking is already occurring? Suggested resources include the twenty-four (24) pages of "References" included in U.S. EPA's December 2012 Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources. See: U.S. EPA: Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources: Progress Report, (EPA 601/R-12/011 December 2012), available at:<http://www.epa.gov/hfstudy>.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

According to section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act, At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. However, even though IDNR representatives were present, it was made clear by the hearing officer at each of the public hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale that the panel members would, in fact, not answer questions. In a number of instances, such as the hearing that I attended in Chicago, the hearing officer stated that IDNR representatives would simply listen and would not respond to comments, concluding that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Agency officials are required by the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act to answer general questions regarding the proposed rules and the rule making process. However because not one agency representative responded to public questions at any of these hearings, these public hearings were held in violation of the Act. To rectify this violation, IDNR should either hold additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or issue a new First Notice, initiating a new round of new public hearings with a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Allowing fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid earthquake zones is deplorable. The New Madrid is a major fault line, causing earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. Not only is increased seismic activity from wastewater wells a concern, but also the damage to the general public and environment. Furthermore, fracking in the 100-year floodplain zone is another environmental disaster waiting to happen. Recall the increase in seismic activity in Tulsa, OK since fracking began in 2009; or in Youngstown, OH, which never experienced an earthquake according to research dating back to 1776, but experienced 109 quakes in 2011 presumably due to fracking wastewater being pumped deep underground; or in North Texas, which was hit with a string of 16 earthquakes in November of 2013, and according to earthquake researcher at the University of Texas, Cliff Frolich, I'd say it certainly looks very possible that the earthquakes are related to injection wells. The truth is undeniable, fracking leads to increased seismic activity. In conclusion, there should be no drilling in our floodplains or seismic zones because it will only lead to widespread devastation.

Sincerely, Ashley Williams Ottawa, IL 61350

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Although it may seem that Illinois has an abundance of clean drinking water, I am concerned about the pollution related to fracking. If we pollute our drinking water, we will not survive. Please make the regulations more stringent to protect all of us, not just those who want to drill for natural gas.

Sincerely, Emily Lorenz Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

An earlier comment quoted OSHA data that suggested that oil and gas drilling workers are 7 times higher than workers from other occupations to die on the job. But even more recent data from the Bureau of Labor statistics suggests that [i]n fact, the fatality rate among oil and gas workers is now nearly eight times higher than the all-industry rate of 3.2 deaths for every 100,000 workers, the highest level since the government started compiling the data in 2003. The article also quotes a NIOSH representative from the CDC, who says that there are numerous reasons for the upsurge in deaths in this sector, including binge-hiring in newly developing industry sectors like hydraulic fracturing, 12-14 hour shifts worked for one to two consecutive weeks, and lack of experience/inadequate training. (http://www.npr.org/2013/12/27/250807226/on-the-job-deaths-spiking-as-oil-drillingquickly-expands?ft=1&f=2&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+NprProgramsATC+%28NPR+Programs%3A+All+Things+Considered%29&utm_content=Yahoo+Search+Results) IDNR absolutely must enforce OSHA standards, particularly regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must also develop and enforce rules that address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, shift-lengths, and transport of material to and from operations-- among many other workplace issues cited in the literature.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

As a student organizer working to avert catastrophic climate change, and am extremely concerned about the IDNR's proposed rules on fracking. There are a plethora of holes in these regulations. For instance, It is irresponsible for planners of the state to consider allowing fracking in areas that are prone to tornadoes, without creating adequate rules that will protect citizens from the toxic flow back water. It is not safe to allow gas companies to frack in Illinois. Not only are these companies destroying fresh, drinking water in a world that continues to lack access to drinking water, but they haven't even established proper means to ensure that this toxic flow back water is stored properly to prevent contamination. The possibilities of this toxic water being out in the open in a land prone to tornadoes - where debris from tornadoes are found over 150 miles from where the tornado is - are disastrous and dangerous to all Illinois residents. I urge you to please reconsider allowing fracking in our state. It is unsafe and dangerous to our health and environment.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin 4750 N Sheridan Chicago, IL 606040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

As a student organizer working to avert catastrophic climate change, and am extremely concerned about the IDNR's proposed rules on fracking. There are a plethora of holes in these regulations. For instance, It is irresponsible for planners of the state to consider allowing fracking in areas that are prone to tornadoes, without creating adequate rules that will protect citizens from the toxic flow back water. It is not safe to allow gas companies to frack in Illinois. Not only are these companies destroying fresh, drinking water in a world that continues to lack access to drinking water, but they haven't even established proper means to ensure that this toxic flow back water is stored properly to prevent contamination. The possibilities of this toxic water being out in the open in a land prone to tornadoes - where debris from tornadoes are found over 150 miles from where the tornado is - are disastrous and dangerous to all Illinois residents. I urge you to please reconsider allowing fracking in our state. It is unsafe and dangerous to our health and environment.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin 4750 N Sheridan Chicago, IL 606040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

As a wife, I worry everyday when my husband goes to work at a steel plant. There are many dangers and chemicals and often some really long hours that he works. I have first hand experience getting a call after he was injured on the job site due to failure of others to follow protocol. It is a call and experience NOBODY should have to experience. We have the opportunity before things begin to take as many precautionary measures as possible. Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

As a wife, I worry everyday when my husband goes to work at a steel plant. There are many dangers and chemicals and often some really long hours that he works. I have first hand experience getting a call after he was injured on the job site due to failure of others to follow protocol. It is a call and experience NOBODY should have to experience. We have the opportunity before things begin to take as many precautionary measures as possible. Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Comment Submission for High Volume Horizontal Hydraulic Fracturing Draft Rules, Please ensure that IDNR incorporate rules that will protect the workers. Since they are dealing with highly toxic chemicals and radioactive chemicals there should be safety measures in place for exposure. Also, limiting work shifts to help reduce accidents on the site and on the roads. Lucia Amorelli

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Days after the devastating tornadoes that hit on Sunday, 11/17/13, people from over 150 miles away were taking part in an online social media effort to return personal items to the affected families. Fracking sites are just as vulnerable to storm damage which is VERY common here in Illinois (including in off months such as January when storms hit northern Illinois a few years ago). In order to keep the people of Illinois safe should sites be hit by a storm we need to think ahead and require as many safety measures as possible be put into place. You can not undo a deed once done and we have the chance NOW to make sure that fracking does not move forward without proper precautions put into place.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman RR 2 Box 20 Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Dear Department of Natural Resources: Illinois agriculture requires access to clean water. It is not in the long-term economic interest of this state for the DNR to leave regulatory loopholes that allow fracking operations to foul our underground aquifers and surface waters. NO OPEN POND STORAGE OF FRACKING WASTEWATER. STRICT ADHERENCE TO INDUSTRY BEST PRACTICES. SERIOUS, PROFIT-CANCELING DAILY FINES FOR OPERATORS WHO DON'T FOLLOW THE GUIDELINES. Respect life. Protect water.

Sincerely, Margaret Nelson Chicago, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Dear IDNR, Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” But this is in direct opposition to the large scale environmental disasters which can be a result of fracking. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “DESTRUCTIVE” and “RUINOUS.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells causing TOXIC and RADIOACTIVE fracking fluids to pour into the ground and contaminate soil and water for hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. You must avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains, for if it is allowed fracking wastewater can spill out of the pit and into floodwaters exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the fracking pit.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Dear IDNR, Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” But this is in direct opposition to the large scale environmental disasters which can be a result of fracking. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “DESTRUCTIVE” and “RUINOUS.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells causing TOXIC and RADIOACTIVE fracking fluids to pour into the ground and contaminate soil and water for hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. You must avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains, for if it is allowed fracking wastewater can spill out of the pit and into floodwaters exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the fracking pit.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji 491 Vaughn Cir Aurora, IL 60502

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Dear IDNR, This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period. Kurt

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Dear IDNR, This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period. Kurt

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Dear IDNR, This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period. Kurt

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Deficient Notice for Public Hearings Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Dialogue and the democratic process are extremely important to me. Having deployed to Iraq as a member of the Army, it is baffling to return home and see examples of the voice of American citizens is being undermined and even silenced during basic democratic processes such as public hearings. This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Even if the Illinois Department of Natural Resources was allowed to regulate industry rather than allow it to continue with business as usual, the IDNR barely has enough funding to manage State Parks. Surface water in lakes, rivers, and streams is already at risk from agricultural run-off and municipal sewage systems. Reversing the Chicago River has contributed to a larger Dead Zone in the Gulf than anything created by the BP spill. Do not put aquifers at risk! Reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robert Kolkebeck Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Even if the Illinois Department of Natural Resources was allowed to regulate industry rather than allow it to continue with business as usual, the IDNR barely has enough funding to manage State Parks. Surface water in lakes, rivers, and streams is already at risk from agricultural run-off and municipal sewage systems. Reversing the Chicago River has contributed to a larger Dead Zone in the Gulf than anything created by the BP spill. Do not put aquifers at risk! Reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robert Kolkebeck Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Even if the Illinois Department of Natural Resources was allowed to regulate industry rather than allow it to continue with business as usual, the IDNR barely has enough funding to manage State Parks. Surface water in lakes, rivers, and streams is already at risk from agricultural run-off and municipal sewage systems. Reversing the Chicago River has contributed to a larger Dead Zone in the Gulf than anything created by the BP spill. Do not put aquifers at risk! Reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robert Kolkebeck Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Failure to address workplace rules or worker safety. How does this affect me: Health and well-being
Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)
Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Failure to address workplace rules or worker safety. How does this affect me: Health and well-being
Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)
Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Failure to address workplace rules or worker safety. How does this affect me: Health and well-being
Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)
Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Frack is oil on crack.

Sincerely, Rachel Azzarello 1808 N. Albany Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Frack is oil on crack.

Sincerely, Rachel Azzarello 1808 N. Albany Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Frack Rigs and Toxic Water Tanks Sent Flying -- will be the headline in southern IL and central IL if fracking moves forward and more tornadoes devastate Illinois as they are sure to do! Climate Change is real and the frackers are just going to accelerate it with their leaking frack wells. Methane is 100 times more potent than CO2 as a green house gas for our climate and 100% of the frack wells will leak eventually, 5% in the first year, 50% in the next 15-16 years and then 100% eventually. Every leaking well spews methane into our atmosphere -- this is the wrong direction IDNR, the wrong direction! The world must embrace renewable energy and they must embrace it now or it will be game over for the planet!!! Please do not allow these frack rigs and water/gas/oil tanks, open pits full of toxic waste water, class 2 wells and all of the rest of the fracking infrastructure to go unsecured in a tornado rich region such as southern and central IL -- thanks! Dr. Lora Chamberlain Frack Free Illinois

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Frack Rigs and Toxic Water Tanks Sent Flying -- will be the headline in southern IL and central IL if fracking moves forward and more tornadoes devastate Illinois as they are sure to do! Climate Change is real and the frackers are just going to accelerate it with their leaking frack wells. Methane is 100 times more potent than CO2 as a green house gas for our climate and 100% of the frack wells will leak eventually, 5% in the first year, 50% in the next 15-16 years and then 100% eventually. Every leaking well spews methane into our atmosphere -- this is the wrong direction IDNR, the wrong direction! The world must embrace renewable energy and they must embrace it now or it will be game over for the planet!!! Please do not allow these frack rigs and water/gas/oil tanks, open pits full of toxic waste water, class 2 wells and all of the rest of the fracking infrastructure to go unsecured in a tornado rich region such as southern and central IL -- thanks! Dr. Lora Chamberlain Frack Free Illinois

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Fracking has proven to be a poor way to stimulate an economy, and is dangerous to the environment. I don't want fracking because it is dangerous to our water supplies, which allow us to have a great agricultural sector along with its negative impacts on global co2 levels. No one should be subject to these toxins.

Sincerely, Sean Jones Normal, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Fracking is bad for Illinois & the The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ron Hall Prospect Heights, IL 60070

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Fracking is the wrong thing to do. It destroys our people as well as our land. I cannot believe that IDNR can let companies override our rights as people.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Give us protection against a tornado disaster compounded by fracking. Fracking safeguards need to be put in place to allow for potential tornadoes.

Sincerely, Annette McMichael 1174 Karen Dr. Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

How can we allow the earth to be miss-treated! Our communities will be adversely effected by toxic run off! Please regulate fracking practices

Sincerely, Richard J. Gradner Sr. Chicago, IL 60620

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

I have heard for years that in at least one of the geologically recent earthquakes in the New Madrid fault the shaking was severe and widespread enough that bells in churches on the East Coast rang by themselves. The only reason there was not severe disaster in St. Louis and across Illinois was that most buildings at that time were one story, perhaps two, and there were relatively few of them. Those things have changed since the early-to-mid 1800's. St. Louis, Champaign-Urbana, Springfield--how would they fare now in a 7-7.5 earthquake in their vicinity? Then add to that catastrophe thousands of gallons of unknown but toxic chemicals, radioactive minerals brought up from underground and also of unknown composition, released from open-air pits or storage tanks by the earthquake, flooding out over the area, contaminating everything and everyone. And the icing on the cake is that the fracking activity--fracturing rocks deep underground--could easily trigger such earthquakes, that otherwise might have happened a thousand years in the future. Until the gas industry has a better method of wastewater disposal than open-air pits, NO fracking should be allowed. They are using toxic volatile organic compounds by the ton, and then letting them evaporate into our air. These include benzene, a known carcinogen that was considered so dangerous that if we wanted to buy it for our lab at Argonne National Laboratory, we needed to fill out a special form justifying the purchase--for amounts in the teaspoon-to-teacup range! But frackers can force it into the earth (and our drinking-water) BY THE TANKER-TRUCKLOAD!!! WITHOUT EVEN TELLING ANYONE--let alone getting permission!!! AND THEN, THE PART THAT COMES BACK OUT IN THE WASTEWATER IS PUT IN OPEN PITS TO POLLUTE THE AIR we all breathe!!! If a teacupful of benzene can give five people cancer, how many people can get cancer from breathing a tanker-truckload? Then there is the enormous water usage. How many years will it take them to drain Lake Michigan? Many industries use a lot of water, and have to clean it up before they can release it back to the rivers and streams it came from. But there is NO WAY to clean up the unholy mix of 600 chemicals that have been identified in fracking wastewater! It is indeed wasted--removed from the water cycle permanently (or at least until an accident releases it from those open pits to contaminate everything it touches for miles around and downstream, all the way to the Gulf of Mexico and in the Gulf itself.) In short, fracking is a total environmental disaster for which we will be paying the price for hundreds of years, and then, because they are getting so much natural gas that we would be able to buy it for almost nothing on an open market, they decide that they will liquify it (a very energy-intensive process) and ship it overseas. Thus, we get all the environmental degradation, cancer cases, droughts and other negatives, while they sell us our gas at prices kept artificially high by shipping our gas overseas for the greater profits of the companies that are poisoning us! What is wrong with this picture? EVERYTHING!!! All fracking should be banned!

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

I was disappointed to learn that the fracking rules suggested by the Illinois DNR were much weaker than they should be in light of the legislation that had passed. That legislation was already a compromise that failed to adequately protect the local communities and their environments in areas being leased for fracking. Frankly, it was the DNR's responsibility to ensure that companies wishing to frack in Illinois would be held to a high but reasonable standard. Business as usual is unacceptable. I have seen the documentary Gasland, which exposes how ruthlessly such oil and natural gas deposits can be developed. The companies involved care only about their profits and not at all about the place where they are operating. There is also the issue of the huge drain on water resources and the ugly and damaging mining of sandstone deposits. I am in favor of a moratorium on fracking but, short of that, I demand rigorous regulation. Remember, too, that continued use of carbon-based fuels is moving us along on the climate change curve in a way that demands a response!

Sincerely, Mary Warren Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

I was disappointed to learn that the fracking rules suggested by the Illinois DNR were much weaker than they should be in light of the legislation that had passed. That legislation was already a compromise that failed to adequately protect the local communities and their environments in areas being leased for fracking. Frankly, it was the DNR's responsibility to ensure that companies wishing to frack in Illinois would be held to a high but reasonable standard. Business as usual is unacceptable. I have seen the documentary Gasland, which exposes how ruthlessly such oil and natural gas deposits can be developed. The companies involved care only about their profits and not at all about the place where they are operating. There is also the issue of the huge drain on water resources and the ugly and damaging mining of sandstone deposits. I am in favor of a moratorium on fracking but, short of that, I demand rigorous regulation. Remember, too, that continued use of carbon-based fuels is moving us along on the climate change curve in a way that demands a response!

Sincerely, Mary Warren Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

IF I HAD MY WAY, OIL AND GAS 'FRACKING' (HYDRAULIC FRACTURING/HORIZONTAL DRILLING) WOULD HAVE NEVER COME TO THE LAND OF LINCOLN!! The Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) is supposed to STRONGLY REGULATE the polluting gas and oil industries, NOT allow them to continue their business-as-usual activities. Please RECONSIDER the inadequate regulations which have been put forth (with their [too] small fines and [too] weak language)--and IMMEDIATELY STOP oil and gas 'fracking' in Illinois to protect our public and environmental health (air, drinking water, land, and climate system).

Sincerely, DENNIS R. NELSON Chicago, IL 60609

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

IF I HAD MY WAY, OIL AND GAS 'FRACKING' (HYDRAULIC FRACTURING/HORIZONTAL DRILLING) WOULD HAVE NEVER COME TO THE LAND OF LINCOLN!! The Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) is supposed to STRONGLY REGULATE the polluting gas and oil industries, NOT allow them to continue their business-as-usual activities. Please RECONSIDER the inadequate regulations which have been put forth (with their [too] small fines and [too] weak language)--and IMMEDIATELY STOP oil and gas 'fracking' in Illinois to protect our public and environmental health (air, drinking water, land, and climate system).

Sincerely, DENNIS R. NELSON Chicago, IL 60609

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

IF I HAD MY WAY, OIL AND GAS 'FRACKING' (HYDRAULIC FRACTURING/HORIZONTAL DRILLING) WOULD HAVE NEVER COME TO THE LAND OF LINCOLN!! The Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) is supposed to STRONGLY REGULATE the polluting gas and oil industries, NOT allow them to continue their business-as-usual activities. Please RECONSIDER the inadequate regulations which have been put forth (with their [too] small fines and [too] weak language)--and IMMEDIATELY STOP oil and gas 'fracking' in Illinois to protect our public and environmental health (air, drinking water, land, and climate system).

Sincerely, DENNIS R. NELSON Chicago, IL 60609

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

It doesn't really matter how much cheap domestic energy you get if you end up contaminating people's drinking water in the process. It doesn't really matter that natural gas has 50% fewer CO2 emissions if you don't take the proper regulatory steps to limit methane emissions. So, we're just going to disregard people's health and safety and disregard our climate and environment all for what? For more natural gas that will only serve as a stopgap between the oil age and the clean energy that follows so we can cling to the fossil fuel age for a bit longer? It doesn't really make any sense to me.

Sincerely, David Dickey Evergreen Park, IL 60805

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

It is irresponsible for planners of the state to consider allowing fracking in areas that are prone to tornadoes, without creating adequate rules that will protect citizens from the toxic flow back water. It is not safe to allow gas companies to frack in Illinois. Not only are these companies destroying fresh, drinking water in a world that continues to lack access to drinking water, but they haven't even established proper means to ensure that this toxic flow back water is stored properly to prevent contaminations. The possibilities of this toxic water being out in the open in a land prone to tornadoes - where debris from tornadoes are found over 150 miles from where the tornado is - are disastrous and dangerous to all Illinois residents. I urge you to please reconsider allowing fracking in our state. It is unsafe and dangerous to our health and environment.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker 2007 S BLUE ISLAND AVE APT 3F CHICAGO, IL 606082928

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

It is unconscious-able that the proposed rules governing fracking operations would not contain OSHA and ALARA regulations to protect all workers. Recent accidents on our highways and railways suggest human error do to fatigue, etc.

Sincerely, M Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

It is unconscious-able that the proposed rules governing fracking operations would not contain OSHA and ALARA regulations to protect all workers. Recent accidents on our highways and railways suggest human error do to fatigue, etc.

Sincerely, M Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Let me remind IDNR of an important article released this summer by William L. Ellsworth of the Earthquake Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA. E-mail: ellsworth@usgs.gov (for your convenience). Source: Science 12 July 2013: Vol. 341 no. 6142 DOI: 10.1126/science.1225942 Link: <http://www.sciencemag.org.proxy.cc.uic.edu/content/341/6142/1225942.full> The title? Injection-Induced Earthquakes. Ellsworth notes: [E]arthquakes can be induced by either reducing the effective normal stress or raising the shear stress (3–5). It has been known for decades that large reservoirs can induce earthquakes either from the effect of the elastic load of the reservoir or by diffusion of elevated pore pressure (34). Well-known examples include the deadly 1967 M 6.3 earthquake in Koyna, India (35). . . . [D]eep reservoirs in tectonically active zones carry a real risk of inducing damaging earthquakes. Earthquakes throughout the world are also recognized to be associated with mining, petroleum and gas production, and geothermal energy extraction. Withdrawal of large volumes of fluid or gas from a reservoir or creation of a void space in a mine may modify the state of stress sufficiently to induce earthquakes that relax the stress perturbations (4). Production may also release tectonic stress. The long-term pumping of groundwater may have induced the deadly Mw 5.1 earthquake in Lorca, Spain, on 11 May 2011 (38). Porepressure changes alone can also induce seismicity, such as by waterflooding for secondary recovery of oil or to maintain the fluid level in a geothermal reservoir, or when a mine is abandoned and allowed to flood (3, 4). He notes that currently injection-induced earthquakes have not caused serious fatalities due to strong building codes—even though earthquakes of similar size have wrecked havoc in other countries. However, he also notes that we don't know enough to predict how hydraulic fracturing will affect seismic activity over the long term. And as the Mother Jones article notes below, homes are destroyed and families struggle to return to normalcy after such quakes. Does IDNR want to be responsible for the loss of property, livelihood, and life? Take Oklahoma, a previously largely earthquake-free zone, which has had multiple recordbreaking earthquakes over the last year or so. Many scientists are suggesting that fracking caused the quakes. Case in point: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2013/03/130329-wastewater-injection-likely-caused-quake/> <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2013/03/does-fracking-cause-earthquakes-wastewaterdewatering> http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/24/okla-earthquake-swarm-fracking_n_4158134.html In this last article, the author states: From 1975 to 2008, central Oklahoma experienced an average of one to three magnitude 3.0 earthquakes or larger. Since 2008, that average has increased to around 40 per year, according to data collected by the U.S. Geological Survey. Clearly, we are still learning about the effects of hydraulic fracturing, but we do know that it can cause earthquakes, even significant earthquakes, in places where there was no significant seismic activity. Hydraulic fracturing thus should not be permitted in areas with active seismic zones, such as the New Madrid Earthquake zone, which has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency labels these areas with the most severe earthquake zone ratings, “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” Placing fracking operations within an

Fair Economy Illinois

active seismic zone at this point in time seems suicidal. In addition, hydraulic fracturing operations should not operate within the 100-year floodplain, where open-air pits are particularly vulnerable, potentially exposing all life to the contaminants in the wastewater.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Many countries around the world have outlawed hydraulic fracturing, and many more are carefully considering how to study and regulate these new practices, since they have been demonstrated to pollute water. Why should Illinois residents be held to lesser standards? The rewards may seem attractive, but the risks to health, industry, and agriculture are too great. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ben Heymer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

MY 6YO WAS INTERESTED IN ARTICLES AND RESEARCH ON OIL, FRACKING, WATER, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND AIR. IM NORMALLY RELUCTANT TO SHARE POLITICAL - CHARGED ISSUES AS I WANT HIM TO WORRY ABOUT LOVING THE EARTH AND EXPANDING HIS CREATIVITY AND COMPASSION. BUT HE HAS SHOWN GREAT INTEREST IN GEOLOGY (EVEN ASKING FOR A BOOK ON SEISMOLOGY) ,THIS WAS RELEVANT RESERACH. I FIGURED I WOULD GIVE HIM THE AGREED ON NUMBERS/FACTS THAT WILL KEEP OUR WORLD AT A SAFE LIVNG PLACE FOR LIFE. AS YOU DO WITH A KIDDO, SCIENCE AND UNBIAS IS IMPORTANT. HIS CONCLUSION WAS FRACKING THUMBS DOWN AND LOW NUMBERS GOOD, BIG NUMBERS BADTHE LOWER THE CARBON NUMBER IN THE ATMOSOPEHER THE BETTER. It has taken me years of wading through poetical jargon sifting what is fact from what is pseudo science and my 6yo in 5 minutes came up with the same conclusion as voting adults inIllinois- we don't want tracking and we don't want anything that puts our home in harm. Please, The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sarah Glover Willowbrook, IL 60527

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

My concern is for the safety of workers, esp. those who work long shifts--16 to 20 hours. How they be alert in working with such sensitive materials and processes? If they are not alert, they are not the only ones to suffer! OSHA regulations concerning exposure of workers to radiation and silica dust--how can it be assured that such testing is done by the companies?

Sincerely, M. Alan Wurth 2 Pioneer Lane Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

No Regulations proposed to deal with the possibility of accidents from tornado activity? Seriously? What are you going to do when one of these sites gets flattened and spreads these chemicals all over the surrounding area? Its on your heads IDNR ...not just these greedy companies , but your individual little heads! Why is this probability not factored into the regulations ? Unbelievable!

Sincerely, Shelley Brown Decatur, IL 62522

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, , IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Betty Bland Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Betty Bland Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:

<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>

http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon 525 South State Street (Apt. 1326) Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:

<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>

http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. New Minden, IL was flattened by a tornado last week. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included “temporarily” stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, M. Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. New Minden, IL was flattened by a tornado last week. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included “temporarily” stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, M. Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water! There must be some inclusion of regulations regarding severe weather and steps taken to prevent contamination via that pathway.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water! There must be some inclusion of regulations regarding severe weather and steps taken to prevent contamination via that pathway.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Mike Reed Box 421 Sheridan, IL 60551

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Mike Reed Box 421 Sheridan, IL 60551

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Miranda Bailey 1822 Park Ave Alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Miranda Bailey 1822 Park Ave Alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_TornadoTracks_1950.png A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra University of Chicago (5630 S. University Avenue) Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_TornadoTracks_1950.png A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_TornadoTracks_1950.png A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_TornadoTracks_1950.png A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, tim conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, tim conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_TornadoTracks_1950.png A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_TornadoTracks_1950.png A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Obviously, central and southern Illinois are prone to tornados. Some kind of safety measures must be included.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

PLEASE don't do this to the people of this planet. We're getting dangerously close to the point of no return. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lindsay Hopkins Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

PLEASE don't do this to the people of this planet. We're getting dangerously close to the point of no return. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lindsay Hopkins Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Please implement stronger regulations on fracking to better protect Illinois' air, water, wildlife, and citizens.

Sincerely, Jim Johannsen Chicago, IL 61085

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: 1.The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. 2.Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). 3.There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: 1.IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. 2.IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: 1.The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. 2.Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). 3.There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: 1.IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. 2.IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Marsha Love Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Tyler Hansen Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. S1-15e of the act gives IDNR the authority collect data, S1-75a2 give the criterion of significant risk and S1-120 gives other applicable laws regarding Hours of Service for Water and Sand Haulers. Yet, the rules do not specify any hours of service rules for sand and wwater delivery truckers; oilfield waiting time exception is for specialty trucks only. The rules also provide nothing on silica exposure tests or meeting OSH Permissible Exposure limites/NIOSH Rec. Exposure limits. Lastly, there are no rules for exposure to radioactivity at all.

Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require testing for work place exposure and for fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations. They need to at least look like they give a care about their employees even if they don't.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Re: Draft Fracking Regulations Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) Lack of a provision for tornado protection on fracking sites. Illinois has had 674 tornadoes in the last decade, and it is known as one of the states with the worst number and severity of tornadoes. Many workplaces have mandatory tornado evacuation drills and designated windowless tornado-safe rooms. Tornadoes not only cause destruction to the buildings they hit, but debris is carried up to several hundred miles away where it can cause secondary damage to buildings far from the original impacted area. Due to global warming we have seen the rate and severity of these severe weather events has been increasing. It is imperative that contaminated fracking flowback water be stored in a secure structure where it will be safely contained even during a severe tornado. The provision allowing temporary storage pools, out in the open with no protection, must be struck as this poses far too great a risk. There also needs to be a provision requiring that frack fluid be stored in a tornado-proof enclosure. Not doing so would risk tornadoes and associated flooding could potentially carry these chemicals unknown distances, putting our communities in danger.

Sincerely, Ivy Czekanski 601 W. Deming Place #502 Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Re: Draft Fracking Regulations Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) Lack of a provision for tornado protection on fracking sites. Illinois has had 674 tornadoes in the last decade, and it is known as one of the states with the worst number and severity of tornadoes. Many workplaces have mandatory tornado evacuation drills and designated windowless tornado-safe rooms. Tornadoes not only cause destruction to the buildings they hit, but debris is carried up to several hundred miles away where it can cause secondary damage to buildings far from the original impacted area. Due to global warming we have seen the rate and severity of these severe weather events has been increasing. It is imperative that contaminated fracking flowback water be stored in a secure structure where it will be safely contained even during a severe tornado. The provision allowing temporary storage pools, out in the open with no protection, must be struck as this poses far too great a risk. There also needs to be a provision requiring that frack fluid be stored in a tornado-proof enclosure. Not doing so would risk tornadoes and associated flooding could potentially carry these chemicals unknown distances, putting our communities in danger.

Sincerely, Ivy Czekanski 601 W. Deming Place #502 Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) . Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) . Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) . Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Scientific Proof that Links Hydraulic Fracturing to Groundwater Contamination: Terms: Methane (/ˈmɛθəːn/, /ˈmiːθəːn/ or /ˈmɛtæn/) is a chemical compound with the chemical formula CH₄ (one atom of carbon and four atoms of hydrogen). It is the simplest alkane and the main component of natural gas. The relative abundance of methane makes it an attractive fuel. However, because it is a gas at normal conditions, methane is difficult to transport from its source. Ethane is a chemical compound with chemical formula C₂H₆. At standard temperature and pressure, ethane is a colorless, odorless gas. Ethane is isolated on an industrial scale from natural gas, and as a byproduct of petroleum refining. Its chief use is as petrochemical feedstock for ethylene production. Propane is a three-carbon alkane with the molecular formula C₃H₈, normally a gas, but compressible to a transportable liquid. A by-product of natural gas processing and petroleum refining, it is commonly used as a fuel for engines, oxy-gas torches, barbecues, portable stoves, and residential central heating. Propane is one of a group of liquefied petroleum gases. The others include butane, propylene, butadiene, butylene, isobutylene and mixtures thereof. Isotopic composition is the number and abundance of the isotopes of the element which are naturally occurring. Isotopes are atoms of the same element (that means they have the same number of protons) but different numbers of neutrons in the nucleus. Isotopes all have identical chemistry but the atoms just have different masses. The simplest example is Chlorine which has two main isotopes Cl-35 has 17 p and 18 neutron (17 + 18 = 35) Cl-37 has 17 p and 20 n (17 + 20 = 37) Every sample of Chlorine always has 3 Cl-35 atoms to every 1 Cl-37 atom. Summary: In a study completed by Robert B. Jackson Et al evidence was found that linked hydraulic fracturing to groundwater contamination by recording the variations of the presence of methane, ethane, and propane in well water of houses, in ratio to the distance of the houses to the gas wells. According to the study, after analyzing 141 drinking water wells across the Appalachian Plateaus physiographic province of northeastern Pennsylvania, examining natural gas concentrations and isotopic signatures with proximity to shale gas wells the presence of methane, ethane, and propane was significantly higher in the well water of homes that were located within one kilometer of a shale gas well compared to those that were farther away. Methane concentrations in drinking water wells of homes <1 km from natural gas wells (59 of 141) were six times higher on average than concentrations for homes farther away. The isotopic compositions also revealed evidence that hydraulic fracturing could be linked to groundwater contamination. Samples were taken from a natural methane seep at Salt Springs State Park in Franklin Forks, Pennsylvania to compare with drinking water from homes in the study, some located within a few kilometers of the spring. There was methane present in all of the water that was sampled. However the isotopic compositions varied. Some of the samples showed the more common trend consistent with Upper Devonian production gases, Upper Devonian gases are likely introduced into the shallow crust either by natural processes over geologic time or through leakage around the casing in the annular space of the production well. However, the samples also revealed that drinking water samples in their dataset with sufficient ethane to analyze isotopic signatures, 11 samples were located <1.1 km from drilling, and 6 samples exhibited clear isotopic reversals similar to Marcellus production gases. In most

Fair Economy Illinois

natural gases, the isotopic composition ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) of $\text{C}_3 > \text{C}_2 > \text{C}_1$ (i.e., $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of ethane is heavier than methane). In thermally mature black shales, however, this maturity trend reverses, creating diagnostic isotopic reversals in which the $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ becomes heavier than $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{C}_2\text{H}_6$ ($\Delta^{13}\text{C} = \delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4 - \delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{C}_2\text{H}_6 > 1$). Natural gas with heavy $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{13}\text{C} > 0$ likely stems from Marcellus production gases or a mixture of Marcellus gases and other annulus gases that migrated to the surface during drilling, well completion, or production. Visual References and Citation: According to the study, after analyzing 141 drinking water wells across the Appalachian Plateaus physiographic province of northeastern Pennsylvania, examining natural gas concentrations and isotopic signatures with proximity to shale gas wells, “Methane was detected in 82% of drinking water samples, with average concentrations six times higher for homes <1 km from natural gas wells ($P = 0.0006$). Ethane was 23 times higher in homes <1 km from gas wells ($P = 0.0013$); propane was detected in 10 water wells, all within approximately 1 km distance ($P = 0.01$).” Their data also stated that “some homeowners living <1 km from gas wells have drinking water contaminated with stray gases.” Also, “Of three factors previously proposed to influence gas concentrations in shallow groundwater (distances to gas wells, valley bottoms, and the Appalachian Structural Front, a proxy for tectonic deformation), distance to gas wells was highly significant for methane concentrations ($P = 0.007$; multiple regression), whereas distances to valley bottoms and the Appalachian Structural Front were not significant ($P = 0.27$ and $P = 0.11$, respectively). Distance to gas wells was also the most significant factor for Pearson and Spearman correlation analyses ($P < 0.01$). For ethane concentrations, distance to gas wells was the only statistically significant factor ($P < 0.005$). Isotopic signatures ($\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$, $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{C}_2\text{H}_6$, and $\delta^2\text{H}-\text{CH}_4$), hydrocarbon ratios (methane to ethane and propane), and the ratio of the noble gas ^4He to CH_4 in groundwater were characteristic of a thermally postmature Marcellus-like source in some cases.” Their study area is within the Appalachian Plateaus physiographic province and includes six counties in Pennsylvania. They sampled 81 new drinking water wells (at an average depth of drinking of 60–90 m) from the three principle aquifers combined the data with results from 60 previously sampled wells in Pennsylvania. They also sampled a natural methane seep at Salt Springs State Park in Franklin Forks, Pennsylvania to compare with drinking water from homes in our study, some located within a few kilometers of the spring. Dissolved methane was detected in the drinking water of 115 of the 141 houses that were sampled. “Methane concentrations in drinking water wells of homes <1 km from natural gas wells (59 of 141) were six times higher on average than concentrations for homes farther away ($P = 0.0006$, Kruskal–Wallis test). Of 12 houses where CH_4 concentrations were greater than 28 mg/L (the threshold for immediate remediation set by the US Department of the Interior), 11 houses were within 1-km distance of an active shale gas well. The only exception was a home with a value of 32 mg CH_4/L at 1.4-km distance.” “Similar to the results for methane, concentrations of ethane (C_2H_6) and propane (C_3H_8) were also higher in drinking water of homes near natural gas wells. Ethane was detected in 40 of 133 homes (30%; 8 fewer homes were sampled for ethane and propane than for methane). Propane was detected in water wells in 10 of 133 homes, all approximately <1 km from a shale gas well ($P = 0.01$). Ethane concentrations were 23 times higher on average for homes <1 km from a gas well: 0.18 compared with 0.008 mg $\text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{L}$ ($P = 0.001$, Kruskal–Wallis). Seven of eight C_2H_6 concentrations >0.5 mg/L were found <1 km from a gas well, with the eighth point only 1.1 km away. Moreover, the higher ethane concentrations all occurred in

Fair Economy Illinois

groundwater with methane concentrations >15 mg/L ($P = 0.003$ for the regression of C2 and C1) “High C3/C1 samples were also an order of magnitude greater than in salt-rich waters from a natural methane seep at the nearby Salt Springs State Park (mean $[C3]/[C1] = 0.000029$ and $[C3] = 0.0022$ mg/L for the salt spring samples). Because microbes effectively do not produce ethane or propane in the subsurface our observed values within approx. 1 km of drilling seem to rule out a biogenic methane source, and they are consistent with both wetter (higher C2 + C3 content) gases found in the Marcellus Formation and our earlier observation of methane in drinking water wells in the region” “Across our dataset, the most thermogenic $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ signatures (i.e., most enriched in ^{13}C) in drinking water were generally found in houses with elevated $[CH_4]$ <1 km from natural gas wells... In fact, all drinking water wells with methane concentrations >10 mg/L, the US Department of Interior’s threshold for considering remediation, have $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ signatures consistent with thermogenic natural gas. Our data also show a population of homes near natural gas wells with water that has $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ signatures that seem to be microbial in origin, specifically those homes shown in Fig. 3A, lower left corner. The combination of our $d_{13}C$ -CH₄... and d_2H -CH₄ data...overall, however, suggests that a subset of homes near natural gas wells has methane with a higher thermal maturity than homes farther away.” “Analyses of $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ and $d_{13}C$ -C₂H₆ can help constrain potential sources of thermally mature natural gases (14, 15, 30). Because organic matter cracks to form oil and then natural gas, the gases initially are enriched in higher aliphatic hydrocarbons C2 and C3 (e.g., $C_3 > C_2 > C_1$; i.e., a relatively wet gas). With increasing thermal maturity, the heavier hydrocarbons are progressively broken down, increasing the C1:C₂+ ratio and leading to isotopic compositions that become increasingly heavier or enriched (31). In most natural gases, the isotopic composition ($d_{13}C$) of $C_3 > C_2 > C_1$ (i.e., $d_{13}C$ of ethane is heavier than methane). In thermally mature black shales, however, this maturity trend reverses, creating diagnostic isotopic reversals in which the $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ becomes heavier than $d_{13}C$ -C₂H₆ ($\delta_{13}C = d_{13}C\text{-CH}_4 - d_{13}C\text{-C}_2\text{H}_6 > 1$) (14, 15, 28, 30, 32). For 11 drinking water samples in our dataset with sufficient ethane to analyze isotopic signatures, 11 samples were located <1.1 km from drilling, and 6 samples exhibited clear isotopic reversals similar to Marcellus production gases (Fig. 4). Conversely, five drinking water samples and spring water from Salt Springs State Park showed the more common trend consistent with Upper Devonian production gases (Fig. 4). In the study area, these isotopic values suggest multiple sources for hydrocarbon gases. The Upper Devonian gases are likely introduced into the shallow crust either by natural processes over geologic time or through leakage around the casing in the annular space of the production well. In contrast, natural gas with heavy $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ and $\delta_{13}C > 0$ likely stems from Marcellus production gases or a mixture of Marcellus gases and other annulus gases that migrated to the surface during drilling, well completion, or production.” Measurements taken by the EPA (Residential Data Reports found at http://www.epaos.org/site/doc_list.aspx?site_id=7555) “independent CH₄ measurements taken by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in Dimock, Pennsylvania in January of 2012 also show three $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ values in drinking water wells between -24.98% and -29.36% $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ and five samples with $d_{13}C$ -CH₄ values in the range of Marcellus gas defined in ref. 28. The heaviest methane isotopic signatures in the EPA samples (-24.98% $d_{13}C$ -CH₄) exceeded the values observed for ethane (-31.2% $d_{13}C$ -C₂H₆), an isotopic reversal ($\delta_{13}C = 6.22\%$) characteristic of Marcellus or other deeper gas compared with gases from Upper Devonian sequences” Jackson, Robert

Fair Economy Illinois

B., Avner Vengosh, Thomas H. Darrah, Nathaniel R. Warrier, Adrian Down, Robert J. Pordea, Stephen G. Osborn, Kaiguang Zhao, and Johnathan D. Karr. "Increased Stray Gas Abundance in a Subset of Drinking Water Wells near Marcellus Shale Gas Extraction." Increased Stray Gas Abundance in a Subset of Drinking Water Wells near Marcellus Shale Gas Extraction. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 24 June 2013. Web. 21 Dec. 2013.
<<http://www.pnas.org/content/110/28/11250.full>>.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Debe Adams Bonnie, IL 62816

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. Allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in flood plains.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. QUESTION ... HAS ANYONE LOOKED AT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HYDRO-FRACKING IN SEISMIC ZONES AND THE LOCATION OF COAL ASH AND COAL SLURRY IMPOUNDMENTS? I THINK THESE WOULD BE PARTICULARLY VULNERABLE, GIVEN THE FACT THAT THEY ARE CONSTRUCTED AS 'TEMPORARY' STRUCTURES. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. Allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in flood plains.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Panelli Juliana 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains. Fracking is short-sighted. I have heard proponents say that it will provide much needed jobs to our state. Everyone knows that this is a half truth, it will provide jobs in the short term but not over the long haul and it will jeopardize our precious earth and water.

Sincerely, Patricia L. Dalke Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Rachele Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Robert Yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Westin Campo
chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Seismicity (Earthquake activity) Water Integrity Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Since public hearings are an important part of the democratic process, it makes sense that there is a proper method of making sure that citizens are informed of the hearing and are given proper time to prepare for such a hearing as well as time to plan the travel and hearing into their schedule, as many people are parents, workers, students, among many other obligations. This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Since public hearings are an important part of the democratic process, it makes sense that there is a proper method of making sure that citizens are informed of the hearing and are given proper time to prepare for such a hearing as well as time to plan the travel and hearing into their schedule, as many people are parents, workers, students, among many other obligations. This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Since public hearings are an important part of the democratic process, it makes sense that there is a proper method of making sure that citizens are informed of the hearing and are given proper time to prepare for such a hearing as well as time to plan the travel and hearing into their schedule, as many people are parents, workers, students, among many other obligations. This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The current regs do not require companies engaged in fracking to take any steps to prevent damage to the fracking site from tornadoes. Certain parts of Illinois are quite prone to tornadoes, similar to the well known tornado alley further west. The regs should require fracking companies to take steps to protect the site from fracking damage, consistent with the tornado history of the area where fracking is occurring. Special vulnerabilities which should be addressed are above ground storage tanks with liquid used in/produced by the fracking process.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Department of Homeland Security has been pushing US citizens for years to have an emergency plan related to a catastrophic event, especially regarding terrorism. However, terror-related events are far less common than tornadoes in central and southern Illinois. So it would follow that an industry that produces toxic waste would have an emergency plan for dealing with tornados. Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Department of Homeland Security has been pushing US citizens for years to have an emergency plan related to a catastrophic event, especially regarding terrorism. However, terror-related events are far less common than tornadoes in central and southern Illinois. So it would follow that an industry that produces toxic waste would have an emergency plan for dealing with tornados. Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Department of Homeland Security has been pushing US citizens for years to have an emergency plan related to a catastrophic event, especially regarding terrorism. However, terror-related events are far less common than tornadoes in central and southern Illinois. So it would follow that an industry that produces toxic waste would have an emergency plan for dealing with tornados. Number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites: ZERO. Number of tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years: 674. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history." Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:
<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The 'fracking' regulations being put forth are a DISGUSTING betrayal of the citizens of Illinois. The petty 'slap on wrist' fines and public reporting are abysmal ! The regulations FAIL to protect citizens from damages cause by operations and the TOXIC brew of chemicals. Your proposal result in substantial HARM to citizens and environments all so a tiny few receive enormous profits.

Sincerely, Jim Oppedahl My City, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources fracking rules are weak - offering little protection for the citizens of Illinois. The fines are so minimal as to be a slap in the face to those who want to protect their homes and property from abuse. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rita McCabe LaGrange, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. As a lifelong Illinois resident it greatly concerns me that the IDNR is not looking out for the best interests of people like me or future generations of Illinoisans. The proof is out there, clear as day, that fracking is dangerous, reckless, toxic and has no place in our state or anywhere on Earth for that matter. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Phil Young Woodridge, IL 60517

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. As a lifelong Illinois resident it greatly concerns me that the IDNR is not looking out for the best interests of people like me or future generations of Illinoisans. The proof is out there, clear as day, that fracking is dangerous, reckless, toxic and has no place in our state or anywhere on Earth for that matter. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Phil Young Woodridge, IL 60517

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Once our water is polluted it is too late. If we allow fracking we need fines which reflect the preciousness of our resources for living. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Holmquist Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Once our water is polluted it is too late. If we allow fracking we need fines which reflect the preciousness of our resources for living. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Holmquist Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider and strengthen the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Personally, I would like to see a statewide ban.

Sincerely, Anglique Sophina Atlanta, IL 61723

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Aana Vigen Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Aaron Levine Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Aaron Levine Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Adam Schenck Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Adam Schenck Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Aileen Eilert Lisle, IL 60532

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Aimee Bass Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alan Dillard Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alan Ehrenberg Chicago, IL 60639

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alex Burns Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alex Burns Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alex Burns Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alexander Beilinson River Forest, IL, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, alexander Hartray Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, alexander Hartray Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, alexander Hartray Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alfred Klinger Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ali Minor Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ali Minor Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alicia Chin chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alicia Wilson Edwardsville, IL 62025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alicia Wilson Edwardsville, IL 62025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alicia Wilson Edwardsville, IL 62025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Alison Petrzilka Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Allan Johnston Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Allie Klug Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Allie Klug Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Allyse Heartwell San Francisco, IL 94117

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Allyse Heartwell San Francisco, IL 94117

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, AM Volz Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amanda Doveatt Naperville, IL 60565

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amanda Doveatt Naperville, IL 60565

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amanda Marquardt Aurora, IL 60506

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amanda Marquardt Aurora, IL 60506

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amelia Estrich Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amelia Estrich Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amelia Estrich Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amelia Estrich Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Andersen KILDEER, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Andersen KILDEER, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Hocking Minooka, IL 60447

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Hocking Minooka, IL 60447

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Robison Palatine, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Robison Palatine, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Robison Palatine, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Robison Palatine, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Spies Chatham, IL 62629

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Spies Chatham, IL 62629

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Amy Timberlake Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andre Orr O Fallon, IL 62269

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andre Orr O Fallon, IL 62269

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andrea Worth Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andrea Worth Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andrew Clarke Chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andrew Heiserman Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andrew Heiserman Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Andrew Locatelli Chicago, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Angel Sides Springfield, IL 62702

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Angel Sides Springfield, IL 62702

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Angela Forf HINSDALE, IL 60521

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Angie Affolter Mundelein, IL 60060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Angus Atkins-Trimnell Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Angus Atkins-Trimnell Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ann inendino Elmwood Park, il, IL 60707

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ann inendino Elmwood Park, il, IL 60707

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ann Joseph Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ann Raven Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anna DiRienzo Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anna DiRienzo Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anne Adams Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anne McGowan Normal, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anne Taylor Bloomington, IL 61701

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anne-Bernadette Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Annemarie Pulawski chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Annette Meitner Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Annette Meitner Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anthony LaRocca Oak Park, IL, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Anthony LaRocca Oak Park, IL, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Arlene Hirsch Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Arlene Hirsch Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Arlene Hirsch Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Arlene Hirsch Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Artemis Asproyerakas CHICAGO, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Arturo Blake Mount Prospect, IL 60056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Arturo Blake Mount Prospect, IL 60056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Arturo Blake Mount Prospect, IL 60056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Fox Frankfort, IL 60423

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Gurtler Peoria, IL 61614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Kopelman Northbrook, IL 60062

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Liszeo Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Luttenbacher West Frankfort, IL 62896

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara McKasson Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Mikulicz Crystal Lake, IL 60014

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Silverman Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Silverman Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Silverman Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barbara Stout Blue Island, IL 60406

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barrett White Forest Park, IL 60130

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Barrett White Forest Park, IL 60130

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ben McCall Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ben McCall Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ben Ogden woodridge, IL 60517

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ben Ogden woodridge, IL 60517

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ben Ogden woodridge, IL 60517

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Benjamin Ross Rockford, IL 61107

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Benjamin Ross Rockford, IL 61107

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Benjamin Roth Palatine, IL 60074

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Benjamin Roth Palatine, IL 60074

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Beth Braun Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Beth Braun Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Beth Braun Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Betsy Kinsey Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Betty Fortner Quincy, IL 62301

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bill and Tesse Donnelly Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bill Bigelow chucago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bill Hughey mt.vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bill Hughey mt.vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bill Hughey mt.vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bill Hughey mt.vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bill Watson River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bob Hagele CHICAGO, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bob Handelsman Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bob Handelsman Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bob Larson Alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bonita Staas Orangeville, IL 61060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bonnie Schwarz Palatine, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bonnie Schwarz Palatine, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bonnie Schwarz Palatine, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bradley Wiesneth Crest Hill, IL 60403

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brent Yenney Macomb, IL 61455

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bret Sher vernon hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brian Donnelly Gurnee, IL 60031

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brian Locascio orland park, IL 60462

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brian Mitchell Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brian Mitchell Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Brigitte Hautzinger Prairie View, IL 60069

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Bryan Ericson Mahomet, IL 61853

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cailin Crowe Evanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cailin Crowe Evanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carey Boehmer Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carey Boehmer Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carey Boehmer Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carol Garman Forest Park, IL 60130

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carol Halpern La Grange, il, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carol Hanson dongola, IL 62926

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carol ritchell Northfield, IL 60093

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carole Spreitzer Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carole Spreitzer Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carole Spreitzer Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carolyn Andrew Lebananon, IL 62254

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carolyn Massey quincy, IL 62301

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Carolynne Cullerton Woodstock, IL 60098

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Catherine Callaghan rolling meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Catherine Callaghan rolling meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Catherine Callaghan rolling meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Catherine Glover Chicago, IL, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Charles Barker Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Charles Barker Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Charles Stransky Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Charlie Brinckerhoff Lake Forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Charlie Suse Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chasity White Zion, IL 60099

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chasity White Zion, IL 60099

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cheryl Becker Lake Bluff, IL 60044

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cheryl Becker Lake Bluff, IL 60044

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cheryl Ivey Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cheryl Ivey Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cheryl Laskasky Addison, IL 60101

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chris Heuman Elburn, IL 60119

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chris Heuman Elburn, IL 60119

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chris Kane Joliet, IL 60431

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chris Roberts Salem, IL, IL 62881

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christine Gordon Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christine Gordon Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christine Hopkins Palos Park, IL 60464

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christine Hopkins Palos Park, IL 60464

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christine Hopkins Palos Park, IL 60464

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christine Irvine Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christopher Dillion Chicago, IL 60661

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christopher Lane chicago??_, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christopher Lee Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christopher Lee Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christy Kurtz Bartlett, IL 60103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Christy Kurtz Bartlett, IL 60103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chuck Temp chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chuck Temp chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Chuck Temp chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cindi Buschschulte Carterville, IL 62918

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Clif Brown Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Clif Brown Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Clif Brown Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Clinton Davis Pontiac, IL 61764

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Clinton Davis Pontiac, IL 61764

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Clinton Davis Pontiac, IL 61764

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cody Pawlowski Elmhurst, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Connor Flexman Sleepy Hollow, IL 60118

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Connor Flexman Sleepy Hollow, IL 60118

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Connor Flexman Sleepy Hollow, IL 60118

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Constance McCabe Lake Forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Constance McCabe Lake Forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Corbin Overmyer Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Corbin Overmyer Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Corey Parker schauburg, IL 60194

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Courtney Manning woodstock, IL 60098

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Craig Washington Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Crystal McAllister Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Crystal McAllister Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Crystal McAllister Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Crystal McAllister Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cynthia Hautzinger prairie view, IL 60069

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cynthia Hautzinger prairie view, IL 60069

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cynthia Hautzinger prairie view, IL 60069

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cynthia Linton Chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Cynthia Linton Chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daisy Mertz Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dale Lorens BERWYN, IL 60402

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dan Pepin Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dan Pepin Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dana Desjardins Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dana Desjardins Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dana March Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daniel Faisal HINSDALE, IL 60521

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daniel Faisal HINSDALE, IL 60521

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daniel Kolender Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daniel Simon Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daniel Simon Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daniel Stafford Oak Brook, IL 60523

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Daniel Stafford Oak Brook, IL 60523

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Danielle Agriopoulos Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Danielle Agriopoulos Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dariusz Mazur Naperville, IL 60563

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Darrel Follman Forest Park, IL 60130

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Darrel Follman Forest Park, IL 60130

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dave Davis Oregon, IL 61061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dave Davis Oregon, IL 61061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dave Skogley Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dave Skogley Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dave Sum Chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Billingham Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Billingham Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Brodnax Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Brodnax Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Butler Urbana, IL 61802

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Camp Deerfield, IL 60015

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Camp Deerfield, IL 60015

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Dorn Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Dorn Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Dorn Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Forte Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Ham Downers Grove, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Kellogg rockord, IL 61103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Kozlowski Woodstock, IL 60098

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Mizerka BROOKFIELD, IL 60513

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Rechs Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Rechs Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Rochelero Bloomington, IL 61704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Schaefer Chicago, Illinois, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Schaefer Chicago, Illinois, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Snyder Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dawn Albanese Elk Grove Village, IL 60007

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dean Peerman Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dean Peerman Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deb Goodman Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deb Hamilton Batavia, IL 60510

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deb Nolte Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deb Nolte Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deborah Lawrence Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deborah Lewis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deborah Lewis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deborah Lewis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Deborah Troester Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Debra Calicchio chicago, IL 60654

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dejan Bajic Chicago, IL 60707

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Derek Broka Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Derek Deters Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Derek Deters Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Devin Hanley Sheridan, IL 60551

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Devon Fryer chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Devon Fryer chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Diana Stokes Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Diane Fascione Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Diane Fascione Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Diane Fascione Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Diane Stuercke Gurnee, IL 60031

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Don Dieckmann Alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Don Hill Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Don Wedd Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Donna Carnes Greenfield, IL 62044

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Donna Carnes Greenfield, IL 62044

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Donna Jaggard Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dori Cole Wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dorothy Stoner Bartlett, IL 60103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Dudley Diehl Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Earl Lemberger Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ed Kulack OAKLAND, IL 94611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Edgar Ortega Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Edith Emmenegger La Grange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Edward Gogol Glenview, IL 60025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Edward Gogol Glenview, IL 60025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Edward Greisch Moline, IL 61265

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eigo Komai Chicago, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eileen Eck Carbondale, IL 63901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eleka Smith Caseyville, IL 62232

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eleka Smith Caseyville, IL 62232

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eleka Smith Caseyville, IL 62232

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elisa Redish Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elisabeth Wengronowitz Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Bullock Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Bullock Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Knock Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Lennon Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Richards Saint Charles, IL 60174

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Wyman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Wyman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Wyman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Elke Rahn Algonquin, IL 60102

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ellen Ingram Chicago, IL 60643

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ellen Ingram Chicago, IL 60643

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ellen Ingram Chicago, IL 60643

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ellen Sharkey Grayslake, IL 60030

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ely Peppers Wheaton II., IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emily McCarthy wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emily McCarthy wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emily Rademacher Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emily Rademacher Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emily white Chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emily white Chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emily white Chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emma W. Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emma W. Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Emma W. Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eric Danley Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eric Danley Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eric Danley Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eric Danley Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eric Walliman Helena, IL 59601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Erika Mikkalo Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Erika Mikkalo Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Erin Brice Chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Erin Brunelle Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Erin Carman-Sweeney Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Esther Allman Frankfort, IL 60423

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Esther Allman Frankfort, IL 60423

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eulalia Braatz Harvard, IL 60033

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eulalia Braatz Harvard, IL 60033

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eulalia Braatz Harvard, IL 60033

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eulalia Braatz Harvard, IL 60033

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eulalia Braatz Harvard, IL 60033

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eva Lauterbach Schaumburg, IL 60193

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Eva Lauterbach Schaumburg, IL 60193

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Felicity Miller-Jones Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Felicity Miller-Jones Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Fr OFM Chicago, IL 60602

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Fr OFM Chicago, IL 60602

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Fran Johns Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Francie Stotz Westchester, IL 60154

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Francisco Aguirre cicero, IL 60804

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Frank Billman chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Franklin Marshall Plainfield, IL 60586

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gabriel Riccio Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gabriel Riccio Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gabrielle Roeder Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gail Moss Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gail Moss Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gary Block Orland Park, IL 60467

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gary Block Orland Park, IL 60467

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gary Block Orland Park, IL 60467

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gary Cozette Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gary Cozette Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gary Ritchie Roanoke, IL 61561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gary Ritchie Roanoke, IL 61561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gaurav Nagpal Chicago, IL 60661

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gene Nemirovsky CHICAGO, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, George Elder Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, George Jones plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, George McJimpsey mokena, IL 60448

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, George Virgil Decatur, IL, IL 62526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, George Virgil Decatur, IL, IL 62526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, George Virgil Decatur, IL, IL 62526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Geraldine Theobald alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Geraldine Theobald alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Geraldine Theobald alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Geri Watson Northlake, IL 60164

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Geri Watson Northlake, IL 60164

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Geri Watson Northlake, IL 60164

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Glenn Golden Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Glenn Golden Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gloria Picchetti Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gloria Picchetti Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Greg Slager Yorkville, IL 60560

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Greg Stawinoga South Holland, IL 60473

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Greg Stawinoga South Holland, IL 60473

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gregory David Wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gregory David Wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gregory David Wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gregory Kampwirth Bluffton, IL 29909

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Gwen Parsin Wauconda, IL 60084

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Hannah Rees Lombard, IL 60148

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Hendrik Smit grayslake, IL 60030

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Holger Braun La Plata, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Holger Braun La Plata, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Holger Braun La Plata, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Holly G Springfield, IL 62704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Holly G Springfield, IL 62704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Holly G Springfield, IL 62704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Hugh MORAN Hoffman Estates, IL 60169

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Hugh MORAN Hoffman Estates, IL 60169

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Hugh MORAN Hoffman Estates, IL 60169

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Isabel Fulcher Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Isabel Fulcher Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, J Balmer Bloomington, IL 61704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, J Beverly Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, J zachial Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jack Harmell North Grafton, IL 1536

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jaime Aruguete Frankfort, IL, IL 60423

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jaime Aruguete Frankfort, IL, IL 60423

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jake yard Galesburg, IL 61401

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, James Petersen Carol Stream, IL 60188

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, James Sanchez Elmhurst, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, James Sanchez Elmhurst, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, James Schreiber Hanover Park, IL 60133

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, James Schroeder chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, James Stephens geneva, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, James Stephens geneva, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jan & Tony Kirch Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jan Gilbert Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jan Gilbert Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jan Tervydil Edwardsville, IL 62025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jan Zanoni glenview, IL 60025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jane Bucci Springfield, IL 62704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jane Bucci Springfield, IL 62704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jane Keefe Elmhurst, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jane wand Quincy, IL 62305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jane Ward Lewistown, IL 61542

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jane Ward Lewistown, IL 61542

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Krawczyk Countryside, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Krawczyk Countryside, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Lipner Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Lipner Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Potts Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Potts Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Stauffer La Grange. IL, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janet Stauffer La Grange. IL, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janice Thomson Chicago, IL 60613

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janice Thomson Chicago, IL 60613

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janie Houchin Bloomington, IL 61705

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Janie Houchin Bloomington, IL 61705

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jason MacFarland Moline, IL, IL 61264

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jason Mortensen Chicago, IL, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jean Vischulis Effingham, IL 62401

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jean Vischulis Effingham, IL 62401

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeanne Kerl Skokie IL, IL 60076

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeff Abbott Gurnee, IL 60031

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeff Cohen Algonquin, IL 60102

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeff Weiner Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeff Weiner Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeff Weiner Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeffery Biss Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeffery Biss Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeffery Biss Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jeffrey Sanders glenview, IL 60025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jenifer Garlitz Joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jenifer Garlitz Joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jenifer Garlitz Joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jenifer Garlitz Joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jennifer Swedberg Brookfield, IL, IL 60513

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jerry Pendergast Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jerry Ross Belleville, IL 62220

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jerry Sonnefeldt Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jessica Schuler Aurora, IL 60506

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jessika Ojea Wonder Lake, IL 60097

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jessika Ojea Wonder Lake, IL 60097

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jessika Ojea Wonder Lake, IL 60097

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jim Evans Elgin, IL 60124

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Joan McCormick-Douglas Crystal Lake, IL 60012

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Joan Simon Lincolnwood, IL 60712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, JoAnn Conrad springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Joanne Kenney Schaumburg, IL 60195

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Joanne Kenney Schaumburg, IL 60195

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jodi Wartenberg joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Johanne Minich Winnetka, IL 60093

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Johannes Steenkamp PALATINE, IL 60067

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John & Rachel Heuman Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Armstrong Metamora, IL 61548

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Brandt Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Brandt Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Coleman Beach Park, IL 60087

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Dillon Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Flood Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Fortner Quincy, IL 62301

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Fortner Quincy, IL 62301

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Grant Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Hockman Riverwoods, IL 60015

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Hockman Riverwoods, IL 60015

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Jay Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Jay Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Knoepfle NAPERVILLE, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Knoepfle NAPERVILLE, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Landers Oneida, IL 61467

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Lyman Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Maka CHICAGO, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Maka CHICAGO, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Maka CHICAGO, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Maka CHICAGO, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John McCarthy Westmont Illinois, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John McCarthy Westmont Illinois, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John McCarthy Westmont Illinois, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John McMurray Riverside, IL 60546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Meeks Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Meeks Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Peeters Kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Peeters Kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Pitocco St Charles, IL 60174

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Pitocco St Charles, IL 60174

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Pitocco St Charles, IL 60174

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Pranke West Chicago, IL 60185

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Stachura Chicago, IL 60634

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Surdyk Lyons, IL 60534

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Surdyk Lyons, IL 60534

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Surdyk Lyons, IL 60534

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Tompkins Naperville, IL 60565

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Tompkins Naperville, IL 60565

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Ward Lewistown, IL 61542

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Weeks Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, John Weeks Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Johnny Villagomez Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Johnny Villagomez Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jonathan Gray Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jonathan Gray Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jonathan Maloney Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Joseph Moran Portland, IL 97221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Joseph stokesbary colo, IL 50056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Joseph stokesbary colo, IL 50056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Josh Fisher Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jovanka Vukosavljevic Chicago,, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Jovanka Vukosavljevic Chicago,, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, JT Holden Waukegan, IL 60087

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Judith Haggengjos Hennepin, IL 61327

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Judith Kasper Rock Island, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Judith Kasper Rock Island, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Judith Meek Oak Lawn, IL 60453

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Judy Solomon Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Julia Martin Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Julia Martin Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Julia Martin Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Julia Martin Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Justin Greer Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Justin Greer Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Justin Walker Madison, IL 53705

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, K Brice EGV, IL 60007

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, K Ward Decatur, IL 62522

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Bravo Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Bravo Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Bravo Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Gollrad Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Gollrad Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Hoffman Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Kortsch Lake Bluff, IL 60044

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Kortsch Lake Bluff, IL 60044

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Orenstein Morton Grove, IL 60053

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karen Smith Westchester, IL 60154

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Karina Sanden Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kate Borghraef Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kate Borghraef Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kate Moriarty Oak Lawn, IL 60453

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kate Moriarty Oak Lawn, IL 60453

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katharine Egan
chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katharine Egan
chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katherine Kuffner Spfld, IL 62704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathleen Kenna-Cooper Chicago, IL 60630

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathleen Scambiaterra La Grange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathleen Scambiaterra La Grange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathryn Keifer Peotone, IL 60468

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathryn Krejci Naperville, IL 60563

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathy Kane Oak Forest, IL 60452

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathy Kane Oak Forest, IL 60452

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathy Kelly Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kathy Ruopp Chicago, IL, IL 60643

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katie Lappe Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katie Lappe Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katie Piotrowska Bartlett, IL 60103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katie Piotrowska Bartlett, IL 60103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katie Piotrowska Bartlett, IL 60103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Katie Riehle Berwyn, IL 60402

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Keelie Witzel Elmhurst, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Keir Quackenbush Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Keir Quackenbush Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kelly Golding Glenview, IL 60025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kelly Lehnherr downers grove, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kelly Lehnherr downers grove, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kelly Lehnherr downers grove, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kelly Lehnherr downers grove, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ken Schulman Mundelein, IL 60060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kenneth Lowell Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kerri Witowski Evergreen Park, IL 60805

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Flozak Brookfield, IL 60513

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Hautzinger prairie view, IL 60069

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Havener Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin McKelvie Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Party Chicago, IL 60610

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Party Chicago, IL 60610

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Party Chicago, IL 60610

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Party Chicago, IL 60610

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kevin Quealy Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kim Sears batavia, IL 60510

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kim Sears batavia, IL 60510

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kirsten Muszynski Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kristin Lems Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kristin Lems Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kristin Lems Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Krystyna Pojedinec chicago, IL 60638

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Krzysztof Miszczak Lake in the hills, IL 60156

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Krzysztof Miszczak Lake in the hills, IL 60156

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kyle Kalinich Elmhurst, IL, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kyle Mortimer south elgin, IL 60177

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Kyle Mortimer south elgin, IL 60177

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lane Pasquesi Lake forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lane Pasquesi Lake forest, IL 60045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lanie Costeas Braidwood, IL 60408

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lanie Costeas Braidwood, IL 60408

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lanie Costeas Braidwood, IL 60408

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laura Bernstein Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laura Eschelbach East Peoria, IL 61611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laura Eschelbach East Peoria, IL 61611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laura Hartman Rock Island, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laura Hartman Rock Island, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laura Hartman Rock Island, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laureen Rizzi Downers, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laurel Smerch Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lauren L Northbrook, IL 60062

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laurence Buxbaum Carlinville, IL 62626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laurie Barsotti Aurora, IL 60504

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lawrence Atkin Evanston, IL, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lawrence Atkin Evanston, IL, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lawrence Trutter Springfield, IL 62703

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lea Augustine Downers Grove, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lee Rodin Skokie, IL 60076

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Leo Welch Belleville IL, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Leo Welch Belleville IL, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Leon Mayr Chicago, IL, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Leon Mayr Chicago, IL, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Leon Mayr Chicago, IL, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Leona Grage Wood Dale, IL 60191

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Leona Grage Wood Dale, IL 60191

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Liane Casten Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Liane Casten Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lillian Gecker Chicago, IL 60613

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lina Cramer Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lina Cramer Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lina Cramer Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Englund Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Falcone-Gard Marshall, IL 62441

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Falcone-Gard Marshall, IL 62441

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Falcone-Gard Marshall, IL 62441

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Fehr Berwyn, IL 60402

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Fox Indian Head Park, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Kruhmin Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Moorman Chicago, IL 60653

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linda Moorman Chicago, IL 60653

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linea Ferguson Wheeling, IL 60090

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Linnea Carlson Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lisa Malmquist Mt Prospect, IL 60056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lisa Malmquist Mt Prospect, IL 60056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lisa Robertson Charleston, IL 61920

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lisa Valiente Bolingbrook, IL 60440

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lisa Valiente Bolingbrook, IL 60440

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Liz Kassly Swansea, IL 62226

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lois Johnson Wonder Lake, IL 60097

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lois Johnson Wonder Lake, IL 60097

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lois Kain Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lori Degman Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lori Reed Galesburg, IL 61401

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lori Reed Galesburg, IL 61401

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lori Slauter North Aurora, IL 60542

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lori Slauter North Aurora, IL 60542

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lorna Paisley East Dubuque, IL 61025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lorraine Darrow Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Loryn Ankeny Arlington Hts, IL 60005

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Louise Nolta Northfield, IL 60093

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Louise Simpson Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, LS Wanner Milford, IL 60953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Luanne Sievers Batavia, IL 60510

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Luanne Sievers Batavia, IL 60510

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lynn Hasselberger north barrington, IL 60010

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lynn Hasselberger north barrington, IL 60010

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lynn Hasselberger north barrington, IL 60010

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lynn Hasselberger north barrington, IL 60010

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lynn Travis Port Byron, IL, IL 61275

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Lynn Travis Port Byron, IL, IL 61275

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, M Adams Glenview, IL 60025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, M Adams Glenview, IL 60025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, M Kubiak BMI, IL 61701

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, M Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, M Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Madeline Norris Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Malcolm Fraser Lake Bluff, IL 60044

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Brady Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Brady Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Brady Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Brady Homewood, IL 60430

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Johnson Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Keylon Downs, IL 61736

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Miller Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Miller Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Nagel Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Rowe Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Rowe Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Rowe Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Thomas Rock Island, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Waltershausen Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Waltershausen Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Wilson Rockford, IL 61107

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margaret Wilson Rockford, IL 61107

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margo Bristow Wheeling, IL 60090

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Margo Bristow Wheeling, IL 60090

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Maria Cancilla Chicago, IL 60613

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Maria De La Torre Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marian Vittinghoff Freeport, IL 61032

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marianne Brun Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marianne Brun Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marianne Organ Chicago, IL 60654

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marianne Organ Chicago, IL 60654

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marianne Williams Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marianne Williams Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Maria-Viktoria Abricka Mundelein, IL 60060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Maria-Viktoria Abricka Mundelein, IL 60060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marie Hatfield-Logan Schaumburg, IL 60173

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marie Hatfield-Logan Schaumburg, IL 60173

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marie Hatfield-Logan Schaumburg, IL 60173

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marie Hatfield-Logan Schaumburg, IL 60173

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marie Kovar Stillman Valley, IL 61084

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marie Manhardt Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marilyn Sieck Huntley, IL 60142

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marilyn Sieck Huntley, IL 60142

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marilyn Sieck Huntley, IL 60142

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marj Woodruff Chicago, IL 60622

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Armknecht Plainfield , IL, IL 60586

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Armknecht Plainfield , IL, IL 60586

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Armknecht Plainfield , IL, IL 60586

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Lester Des Plaines, IL 60016

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Lester Des Plaines, IL 60016

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Lester Des Plaines, IL 60016

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Lundholm Palatine, IL 60074

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Novotny countryside, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Novotny countryside, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Swinburne Taylorville, IL 62568

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Syverson Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Syverson Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mark Tomlinson Gurnee, IL 60031

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marnelle Curtis Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Marta Hidegkuti Chicago, IL 60613

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Martha Buchan Lincolnshire, IL 60069

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Martha Pierce EVANSTON, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Beling Ingleside, IL 60041

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Beling Ingleside, IL 60041

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Beling Ingleside, IL 60041

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Beling Ingleside, IL 60041

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Bennett Chicago, IL 60659

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Bradford Ecanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Bradford Ecanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary DeClue Litchfield, IL 62056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Newman Springfield, IL 62704

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Phillips Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Phillips Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Shesgreen Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Shesgreen Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Southard La Grange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Swanson carterville, IL 62918

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mary Swanson carterville, IL 62918

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mathieu Sussman Elmhurst, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mathieu Sussman Elmhurst, IL 60126

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Matt Hess Aurora, IL 60504

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Matt Slade loves park, IL 61111

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Maureen allen Saint Charles, IL 60174

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Maureen Sergel Belvidere, IL 61008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Max Boton Buffalo Grove, IL 60089

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Max Boton Buffalo Grove, IL 60089

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Max Boton Buffalo Grove, IL 60089

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Maya Kosover Evanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mayra Iniguez Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Melissa Brice Elk Grove Village, IL 60007

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Melissa Diehl schauburg, IL 60193

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mercy E Rockford, IL 61103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Meredith West Chicago, IL 60622

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michael Anthony Crete, IL 60417

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michael Brzoska Yorkville, IL 60560

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michael Brzoska Yorkville, IL 60560

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michael Hollins Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michael Lahey Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michael Walters Chicago, IL 60622

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michael Walters Chicago, IL 60622

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michele Kunze Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michelle Anderson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michelle Bobier Chicago, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michelle Bobier Chicago, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Michelle Stearn Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mike Dotson Carterville, IL 62918

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Mimi Harris Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Burke Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Henninger Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Henninger Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Klein Palatine, IL 60078

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Lamia Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Murphy Maryville, IL 62062

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Nowakowski Prospect Heights, IL 60070

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Nowakowski Prospect Heights, IL 60070

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Singham Evanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Singham Evanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Singham Evanston, IL 60203

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Strickland Edwardsville, IL 62025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Natalie Watson Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Natalie Watson Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Natasha Zaretsky Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Natasha Zaretsky Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Natasha Zaretsky Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nathan Wolf Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nathan Wolf Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nathan Wolf Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nathan Wolf Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nathan Wolf Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nathan Wolf Libertyville, IL 60048

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nayeem Aslam Villa Park, IL 60181

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nick Chrisos Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nicole Poloski
Nicole Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, NJ Madison Chicago, IL 60620

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nora Lincoln Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Norlyn Dimmitt Geneva, IL, IL 60134

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Norma Johnson Rock Island, IL 61201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Padraig O'Hara Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Padraig O'Hara Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Pam McDonald Montgomery, IL 60538

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Pamela Kersting Bolingbrook, IL 60440

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Pamela Kunke Minooka, IL 60447

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Pamela Kunke Minooka, IL 60447

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Pat Ahlberg Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Pat coleman Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrice Egleston chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrice Egleston chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrice Egleston chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrice Egleston chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia and Clifford Terry Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia and Clifford Terry Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia and Clifford Terry Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia Herrmann Wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia Herrmann Wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia Pruitt Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia Schlosser Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia Schlosser Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patricia Schlosser Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrick Bigoness BROOKFIELD, IL 60513

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrick Devine Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrick Sabol Wheeling, IL 60090

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrick Wooldridge Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrick Wooldridge Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrick Wooldridge Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patrick Wooldridge Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Patti Renda Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Paul beerkens Chicago, IL 60610

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Paul Gantner Campton Hills, IL 60175

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Paul Lyons urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Paula Korzonek Oak Forest, IL, IL 60452

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Paula Propst Steward, IL 60553

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peggy mcgrath Oak park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Penny Blubaugh Chicago, IL 60646

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Penny Cooper Bridgeport, IL 62417

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Penny Vollmer Pontiac, IL 61764

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Penny Vollmer Pontiac, IL 61764

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Penny Vollmer Pontiac, IL 61764

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Penny Vollmer Pontiac, IL 61764

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peter Frazer Wilmington, IL 60481

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peter Frazer Wilmington, IL 60481

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peter Hoy Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peter Hoy Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peter Schafer Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peter Toepfer Chicago, IL 60609

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Peter Toepfer Chicago, IL 60609

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Phyllis Washington arlington heights, il., IL 60005

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, R Shah Peoria, IL 61615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rabbi Cohen Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rachel Eclov Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rachel Schupick Burlington, IL 52242

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rachel Schupick Burlington, IL 52242

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rachel Schupick Burlington, IL 52242

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ram Todatry Naperville, IL 60563

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ram Todatry Naperville, IL 60563

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ram Todatry Naperville, IL 60563

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rebecca Clough Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rebecca Clough Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Reinhard D?_sterh??ft Oberursel, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Reinhard D?_sterh??ft Oberursel, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Remya Joseph Aurora, IL 60506

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Remya Joseph Aurora, IL 60506

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ricca Slone Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Riccardo Nunziati Chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Richard Rouse Park Ridge, IL 60068

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Richard Sorokas Skokie, IL 60077

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Richard Wosylus Smithton, IL 62285

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Richard Zdeb Round Lake Park, IL 60073

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rick Johnson Wonder Lake, IL, IL 60097

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robert Castillo Naperville, IL 60450

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robert Gifford Stelle, IL 60919

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robert Pechacek Belvidere, IL 61008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robert Rush saint louis, IL 63114

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Roberta Nash Northfield, IL 60093

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Roberta Nash Northfield, IL 60093

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Roberta Williams Itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Roberta Williams Itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Roberta Williams Itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robin Pinsof Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robin Pinsof Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robin Schreier Crystal Lake, IL 60012

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robin Schreier Crystal Lake, IL 60012

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Robin Schreier Crystal Lake, IL 60012

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rodney Alexander Chicago Heights, IL 60411

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rosalie Riegle Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rosalie Riegle Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rosalie Riegle Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Roy Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruby Jung Henry, IL, IL 61537

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rudolph Zarate Deerfield, IL 60015

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Rudolph Zarate Deerfield, IL 60015

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Goring Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Goring Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Goring Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Harris Carthage, IL 62321

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Harris Carthage, IL 62321

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Hosek chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Rohan Joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ruth Thiede Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ryan Goble Aurora, IL 60503

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Ryan Wallace Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sabolch Horvat chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Samantha Maffeo Lincolnwood, IL 60712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sander Gjuraj Round Lake, IL 60073

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sandi Redman Skokie, IL 60077

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sandi Redman Skokie, IL 60077

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sandi Redman Skokie, IL 60077

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sandra Freda Evanston Illinois, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sanford Wilder Grafton, IL 62037

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sara Angst Round Lake Beach, IL 60073

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sara Brennan Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sara Dunne Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sara Sayigh Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sarah G. Niles, IL 60714

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sarah Shaw Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sarah Winblad CHICAGO, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Scott Weber Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sean Kelleher Lincolnshire, IL 60069

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sean Phalen Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sergio Rivera Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sergio Rivera Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Shannon Peterson Homer Glen, IL 60491

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Shelley Gordon Chicago, IL 60654

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sherry Block Clarendon Hills, IL 60514

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sheryl Hogan ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Simon Marshall Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Simon Wandfluh Bern, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sital Sathia Hoffman Estates, IL 60169

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sital Sathia Hoffman Estates, IL 60169

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stan Schultz Round Lake Beach, IL 60073

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephanie Denzer Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephanie Leite Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephanie S Peoria, IL 61614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephen Anderson Deerfield, IL 60015

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephen Gliva Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephen Hoppe Chicago, IL 60622

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephen Hoppe Chicago, IL 60622

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stephenie Haehnel South Elgin, IL 60177

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steve Miller nauvoo, IL 62354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steve Schneider barrington, IL 60010

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steve Schneider barrington, IL 60010

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steve Schueth Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steve Wanninger Rockford, IL 61103

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steven Bates Evanston IL, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steven Bates Evanston IL, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steven Bates Evanston IL, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steven Halm Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steven Halm Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steven Nelson Crystal Lake, IL 60014

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Steven Nelson Crystal Lake, IL 60014

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Stuart Pearson Joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Students Network Chennai, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Students Network Chennai, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Students Network Chennai, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sue Eberhardt Woodstock, IL 60098

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sue Gillan
Chicago, Illinois, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sue Gillan
Chicago, Illinois, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sue Gillan
chicago, Illinois, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sue Shulman prospect hts, IL 60070

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Susan Fleming Plainfield, IL 60586

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Susan Leibowitz Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Susan Leibowitz Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Susan Spengler Palatine, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Susan Thompson Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Susan Vorwerk Flossmoor, IL 60422

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Susan Witzel Aurora, IL 60503

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sylvie Decety Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sylvie Decety Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Sylvie Decety Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, T C C H, IL 60403

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, T C C H, IL 60403

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, T C C H, IL 60403

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, T Jones Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tami Hottes Pinckneyville, IL 62274

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tammy Lyons Mascoutah, IL 62258

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tammy Lyons Mascoutah, IL 62258

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Teresa Earp Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Terri Abbott Wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thom Herakovich Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thom Herakovich Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Gray Harvard, IL 60033

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Humphrey Skokie, IL 60076

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Joseph O'Fallon, IL 62269

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Joseph O'Fallon, IL 62269

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Olmsted Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Scully Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Slowik Schaumburg, IL 60173

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Williams Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Thomas Williams Evanston, IL 60201

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tibaie Suarez SKOKIE, IL 60076

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tim Baer Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tim Kaiser Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tim Rule oak park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tim Rule oak park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tina Bach Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tina Bach Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tina Bach Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tina Bach Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tina VanNatta Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tom Galka la grange, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tom Galka la grange, IL 60525

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tom Ranieri Lisle, IL 60532

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tom Ranieri Lisle, IL 60532

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tom Ranieri Lisle, IL 60532

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tom Zajac Chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Trisha Connolly Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tyler Emde Mundelein, IL 60060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tyler Emde Mundelein, IL 60060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Tyler Emde Mundelein, IL 60060

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, V Evan Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Victor Mazzeo Berwyn, IL 60402

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Victor Przysiezny Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Victor Przysiezny Highland Park, IL 60035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Virginia Wiltshire-Gordon Wilmette, IL 60091

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Vishal Bajaj Chicago, IL 60661

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Vishal Bajaj Chicago, IL 60661

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Vj Capalbo Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Wallace and Sonja Chan Kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Whitney Bush Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Fowee wheaton, IL 60189

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Hassig Mt. Prospect, IL 60056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Hassig Mt. Prospect, IL 60056

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Hess Edwardsville, IL 62025

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Kavanagh Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Lorch Joliet, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Lorch Joliet, IL

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, William Preston Crete, IL 60417

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Wyman Whipple Dahinda, IL 61428

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Y Winston Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Y Winston Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Yvonne White kinmundy, IL 62854

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Yvonne White kinmundy, IL 62854

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Yvonne White kinmundy, IL 62854

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Yvonne White kinmundy, IL 62854

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Yvonne White kinmundy, IL 62854

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. At least take a more serious look at the terrible record we've seen elsewhere. Big Money is corrupting our society, and it may be affecting the decisions DNR makes. Don't let that happen.

Sincerely, Harlan Johnson Rockford, IL 61102

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Clean water is critical for all life and frackers have been notorious for using chemicals that pollute and poison water. Also, after fracking, once beautiful land looks hideous, without any plant life. Illinois needs money but we should not become a state where the countryside looks like the site of a chemical war and people should not be afraid to drink our water. Once the water is contaminated, there's no turning back. We can't trust the frackers to be ethical, only to be profitable.

Sincerely, Barbara Pohl Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Clean water is critical for all life and frackers have been notorious for using chemicals that pollute and poison water. Also, after fracking, once beautiful land looks hideous, without any plant life. Illinois needs money but we should not become a state where the countryside looks like the site of a chemical war and people should not be afraid to drink our water. Once the water is contaminated, there's no turning back. We can't trust the frackers to be ethical, only to be profitable.

Sincerely, Barbara Pohl Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois NOW to protect our air, water, and climate. Furthermore, great lakes states should be unified in this approach, as the long term effects of fracking are unknown, but likely DEVASTATING to fresh water sources.

Sincerely, Dan Norris Des Plaines, IL 60016

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois NOW to protect our air, water, and climate. Furthermore, great lakes states should be unified in this approach, as the long term effects of fracking are unknown, but likely DEVASTATING to fresh water sources.

Sincerely, Dan Norris Des Plaines, IL 60016

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Having reviewed a number of scientific articles, I am very concerned about the long-term effects on the health of residents and the impact on the environment.

Sincerely, Christine Cupaiuolo Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Having reviewed a number of scientific articles, I am very concerned about the long-term effects on the health of residents and the impact on the environment.

Sincerely, Christine Cupaiuolo Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Hold off for 25 years, the process is flawed.

Sincerely, Daniel Wagner New Berlin, IL 62670

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Hold off for 25 years, the process is flawed.

Sincerely, Daniel Wagner New Berlin, IL 62670

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. I have relatives who live in W. Va where fracking has destroyed the farms and homes of MANY people including many who are victims of their neighbors' allowing fracking and the destruction of lands and wells with no compensation. The lands and homes are now worth very little so they can not be sold. The people are SOL while the energy companies are doing VERY WELL!. I do realize that fracking has provided much cheaper fuel for many people particularly in the east as well as cheaper feed stock for the plastics industry as well as jobs for Americans, but at what cost to our lands and the environment. IF it could be done safely, all well and good but at this time it is NOT SAFE, CAUSING EARTHQUAKES AND RUINING LANDS AND HOMES! PLEASE tighten up all of the rules and regulations before we look like W. VA!

Sincerely, Hilda Fischer Oak Park, IL 60304

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Illinois has other options that will create MORE jobs, MORE wealth and MORE energy WITHOUT polluting BOTH the air and the water and only producing more green-house gases.

Sincerely, James Van Camp Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. It is time that the people have a voice in deciding what is best for us.

Sincerely, Mary Meyers Mokena, IL 60448

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. It is time that the people have a voice in deciding what is best for us.

Sincerely, Mary Meyers Mokena, IL 60448

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Let other states screw up their land and screw their residents for the foreseeable future. Illinois is a clean place -- there's no need to sell it out to allow fossil fuel companies to externalize their costs on the rest of us.

Sincerely, Russ Klettke Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Now is the time to start cracking. Now is the time to get serious about renewable energy.

Sincerely, Michael Goldberg Chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Now is the time to start cracking. Now is the time to get serious about renewable energy.

Sincerely, Michael Goldberg Chicago, IL 60611

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Please take a rigorous scientific approach and weigh heavily the impacts that fracking can have on our environment and our health with the boon in cheap domestic energy

Sincerely, Brock Auerbach-Lynn Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Please take a rigorous scientific approach and weigh heavily the impacts that fracking can have on our environment and our health with the boon in cheap domestic energy

Sincerely, Brock Auerbach-Lynn Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Science shows that fracking is hurtful, and that 100% renewable energy is the way to go. These huge oil companies think they can get away with anything - well, we the people will fight back!

Sincerely, Carolyn McDonnell Oak Lawn, IL 60453

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Science shows that fracking is hurtful, and that 100% renewable energy is the way to go. These huge oil companies think they can get away with anything - well, we the people will fight back!

Sincerely, Carolyn McDonnell Oak Lawn, IL 60453

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Seriously, we need you to do the RIGHT thing, we elected you to speak on our behalf.

Sincerely, Sara Meadowcroft Yorkville, IL 60560

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Such short-sighted and desperate action is a clear indication that the industrial addiction to oil and other hydrocarbon fuels needs to end. If we are willing to sacrifice other necessary natural resources, including water, one of the most basic components of life on this planet, in order to feed the addiction then there is no hope for a sustainable tomorrow. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources can ensure that the citizens of Illinois, current and future, are able to thrive in an environment in which such basic resources are plentiful and unpolluted by creating more severe regulatory legislation. By failing to do so, you fail the people of Illinois as well as set a dangerous precedent for the future.

Sincerely, Pat Leary Riverside, IL 60546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Such short-sighted and desperate action is a clear indication that the industrial addiction to oil and other hydrocarbon fuels needs to end. If we are willing to sacrifice other necessary natural resources, including water, one of the most basic components of life on this planet, in order to feed the addiction then there is no hope for a sustainable tomorrow. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources can ensure that the citizens of Illinois, current and future, are able to thrive in an environment in which such basic resources are plentiful and unpolluted by creating more severe regulatory legislation. By failing to do so, you fail the people of Illinois as well as set a dangerous precedent for the future.

Sincerely, Pat Leary Riverside, IL 60546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. Such short-sighted and desperate action is a clear indication that the industrial addiction to oil and other hydrocarbon fuels needs to end. If we are willing to sacrifice other necessary natural resources, including water, one of the most basic components of life on this planet, in order to feed the addiction then there is no hope for a sustainable tomorrow. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources can ensure that the citizens of Illinois, current and future, are able to thrive in an environment in which such basic resources are plentiful and unpolluted by creating more severe regulatory legislation. By failing to do so, you fail the people of Illinois as well as set a dangerous precedent for the future.

Sincerely, Pat Leary Riverside, IL 60546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. There are stiffer penalties for drivers than there are for frackers, and that is just wrong. Let's make sure we safeguard the health of those unlucky enough to live in fracking areas from poisoned ground water and potential earth quakes. There is too much information out there from states that already have fracking for Illinois to turn a blind eye, as has been the case so far. Start taking the health and safety of Illinois residents seriously!

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. This process is an abomination and one step closer in the wrong direction.

Sincerely, Gregory Brecher Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate. With some of the richest farmland soil in the country. WHY?

Sincerely, Melissa Berkshire Chicago, IL 60659

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, climate and citizens.

Sincerely, David Sincox Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, climate and citizens.

Sincerely, David Sincox Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, climate and citizens.

Sincerely, David Sincox Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations. Weak regulations do nothing to protect the health and safety of the people of Illinois and our environment. We must stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, David Sincox Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. The regulations should protect Illinoisans from polluted air, water and damage to our climate. Please stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Churchill Oregon, IL 61061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. The regulations should protect Illinoisans from polluted air, water and damage to our climate. Please stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Nancy Churchill Oregon, IL 61061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. The water used is actually more important to save than getting the oil. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Richard Roche Downers Grove, IL 60515

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. There are so many risks with this process! Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Courtney Batio Elk Grove, IL 60007

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The INDR has violated its own administrative rules by not providing the required public notice for any of the public hearings. In each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. I can only assume the reason for the rush, especially during the holiday season, is to give the fracking industry the advantage by not allowing the public ample time to prepare for the hearings. Just who, or what, is controlling the process? Fracking is inherently dangerous and destructive and this rush to frack our state into a contaminated uninhabitable mess is insane. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or preferably, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lois Kain 1602 S Carle Ave Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The only safe energy solution for Illinois is 100% renewable power, as soon as possible, and every fracking well drilled is a step in the wrong direction. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Suzanne Dallas Skokie, IL 60076

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The risk of damage from tornadoes is real. The practice of fracking would surely increase risks to the people in the state.

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The risk of large scale environmental disasters How does this affect me: Health and well-being
Radioactivity Seismicity (Earthquake activity) Water Integrity . Relevant parts of the Proposed
Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) . Section 1-53 of the regulatory
bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and
safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread
environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid
Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been
known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois
Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone
ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking
and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster.
Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines,
injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and
contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio
Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to
conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking
operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The
environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads,
flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in
Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the
South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River,
extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the
country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits
fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out
of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine,
radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The risk of large scale environmental disasters How does this affect me: Health and well-being Radioactivity Seismicity (Earthquake activity) Water Integrity . Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) . Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The risk of large scale environmental disasters How does this affect me: Health and well-being Radioactivity Seismicity (Earthquake activity) Water Integrity Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Avoid fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The risk of large scale environmental disasters How does this affect me: Seismicity (Earthquake activity) Water Integrity . Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) . Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The risk of large scale environmental disasters How does this affect me: Seismicity (Earthquake activity) Water Integrity . Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) . Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones and flood plains.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The risk of large scale environmental disasters How does this affect me: Seismicity (Earthquake activity)Water Integrity Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) Section 1-53 of the regulatory bill requires that fracking operations be conducted in a “manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution.” And yet, the rules do not address the risk of large-scale and widespread environmental disasters that can occur as a result of fracking in the Wabash Valley and New Madrid Earthquake Zones or in the Illinois 100-year floodplain. The New Madrid Earthquake zone has been known to historically cause “major” earthquakes of over 7 on the Richter magnitude scale. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency itself identifies these areas with its most severe earthquake zone ratings of “Destructive” and “Ruinous.” An earthquake of these magnitudes, compounded with fracking and injection wells spread throughout the affected zone is quite literally, a recipe for disaster. Furthermore earthquakes of these magnitudes can easily damage fracking wells, open air pits, pipelines, injection wells - causing toxic and radioactive fracking fluids to pour out into the ground and contaminate the soil and groundwater sources of hundreds of thousands of Illinoisans. Even Ohio Governor, John Kasich, a fracking advocate, has issued an executive order requiring operators to conduct seismic studies before the state will issue well permits. Similarly, allowing any sort of fracking operations to occur within the Illinois 100 year floodplain zone is also asking for disaster. The environmental devastation caused by the recent floods in Colorado is a case in point. Inundated oil pads, flooded wells, overturned tanks, and ruptured lines were just a few of problems experienced in Colorado as a result of wide-scale flooding. A damaged oil tank dumped 5,250 gallons of oil into the South Platte River south of Milliken, Colorado on 9/18/13 during the flood. The South Platte River, extends to Nebraska and then filters into the Ogallala Aquifer which serves much of the middle of the country. Consider that Harrisburg, IL had major floods in 2008 and 2011, followed by a devastating tornado in 2012 (Southern Illinois' frequent tornadoes being another risk to gas rigs, pipelines, tanks and pollution releases). (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-dyqBbHPueU>, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6pdISevwihk>, <http://www.durbin.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/pressreleases?ID=349edb4d-49a4-48cc-b26e-568509d113bd>). Open-air pits—which the Rules allow—are particularly vulnerable in a flood. When open-air pits fill with water, there is nothing covering the surface to prevent the fracking wastewater from spilling out of the pit and into the floodwaters, exposing every living thing downstream to the chemicals, brine, radioactivity, etc. that was in the pit. Solution: Prohibit fracking in active seismic zones, flood plains and historic tornado alleys.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

The tornadoes that struck Washington, IL would have been even more devastating had Illinois already been engaged in the industrialization of fracking. As demonstrated by paper envelopes found hundreds of miles from the environs of the tornado area, chemicals and produced waste with radioactive elements would have been spread far beyond the local communities, which would have been ruined. Can you imagine the cost of clean up? Clean up. Would that be possible? Because of the weather pattern change, and the fact that half the tornado warnings in twenty Novembers occurred in this past November, the Rules are insufficient. The Rules must be rewritten.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus 1806 Marion Ct Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. 1.IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. 2.IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Gerson omar Ramirez 4414 N christiana Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

There is little future in the waste of the guaranteed. Illinois is rich in beauty, please don't frack it up.

Sincerely, Greg Keilback Winnebago, IL 61088

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

There is little future in the waste of the guaranteed. Illinois is rich in beauty, please don't frack it up.

Sincerely, Greg Keilback Winnebago, IL 61088

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

There is NO provision to address the danger from tornadoes. None of the draft regulations proposed by IDNR provide safety measures for tornado strikes on fracking sites, despite that there have been 674 tornadoes in Illinois in the last 10 years. Historically, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is very high. "In fact, Illinois has experienced some of the worst tornadoes in US history," reports Dr. Jim Angel, Illinois State Climatologist. Every county in Illinois has had multiple tornadoes as demonstrated by the maps in the following links:

<http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/ilmaps.htm>
http://www.isws.illinois.edu/atmos/statecli/tornado/NewMaps/MRCC_Tornado... A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. What would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornado has been found over 150 miles away. Imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water!

Sincerely, Dolores C. Pino, B.A., J.D. 7200 Wilson Terrace Morton Grove, IL 60053-1142

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Janet Elizabeth Donoghue 5082 Springer Ridge Rd Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Janet Elizabeth Donoghue 5082 Springer Ridge Rd Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Democratic participation requires adequate notification. DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period. I LIVE IN CHICAGO - THERE SIMPLY WAS NOT ADEQUATE NOTICE PROVIDED - AND THEN, THE SELECTED HEARING DATE WAS JUST TWO DAYS BEFORE THANKSGIVING. TO MAKE MEANINGFUL COMMENTS, ONE NEEDS TO BE FAMILIAR WITH AND UNDERSTAND: * THE 123-PAGE HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATORY ACT; * 135 PAGES OF PROPOSED RULES FOR THE HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATORY ACT; AND *16 PAGES OF PROPOSED RULES FOR SEISMICITY. IS THE IDNR REALLY INTERESTED IN OBTAINING COMMENTS FROM CONCERNED RESIDENTS, ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS, SCIENTISTS, HEALTH PROFESSIONALS AND EDUCATORS - OR, IS THE IDNR FAST-TRACKING THE PROCESS ON BEHALF OF THE INDUSTRY? UNFORTUNATELY, THE LACK OF ADEQUATE TIME AND THE FACT THAT THE COMMENT PERIOD COINCIDES WITH THREE MAJOR HOLIDAYS RELAYS THE LATTER. ADDITIONAL HEARINGS SHOULD BE HELD, WITH PROPER NOTICE, TO ENSURE THAT ALL INTERESTED AND POTENTIALLY AFFECTED PARTIES HAVE ADEQUATE TIME TO PREPARE COMMENTS AND ADJUST SCHEDULES SO THAT THEY CAN ATTEND.

Fair Economy Illinois

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rachele Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rachele Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment is in response to the paragraphs of the published notices setting the dates for the public hearings on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: DNR did not provide the required public notice for any of the public hearings, because in each case the notice for the hearing was not published in the Illinois Register at least 20 days before the hearing. Although the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act allows DNR to hold a public hearing, in response to a request for a hearing, less than 20 days after public notice in the Illinois Register if the notice of hearing is published in the notice of proposed rulemaking (5 ILCS 100/5-40), DNR has chosen by rule to require a minimum of 20 days' notice. DNR's adopted rule for scheduling public hearings states as follows: The Hearing Officer shall set a time and place for hearing and shall give notice as follows, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing; a) to the proponent, by mail; b) to members of the general public, by means of a general news release and notice in the Illinois Register. 2 Ill. Admin. Code 825.140. The first notice of public hearings--for Chicago and Ina--was published in the Illinois Register on November 15, 2013. But the Chicago hearing took place on November 26, 2013, and the Ina hearing took place on December 3, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. The second notice of public hearings--for Effingham, Decatur, and Carbondale--was published in the Illinois Register on December 6, 2013. But the Effingham hearing took place on December 16, 2013, the Decatur hearing took place on December 17, 2013, and the Carbondale hearing took place on December 19, 2013. Each of those hearings was held on less than 20 days' notice. Thus, DNR's public hearings were held in violation of its own administrative rules. These violations deprived the citizens of a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The remedy for this violation is either additional hearings in these areas, each with the required minimum 20 days' notice, or alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment relates to 245.100-.120. Operators should not be prohibited from fracking operations in active seismic zones, such as those around the New Madrid fault, and in flood plains, such as the Mississippi and Ohio flood plains. The potential for environmental disaster in these areas is too great to allow fracking.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

This comment relates to 245.100-.120. Operators should not be prohibited from fracking operations in active seismic zones, such as those around the New Madrid fault, and in flood plains, such as the Mississippi and Ohio flood plains. The potential for environmental disaster in these areas is too great to allow fracking.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Before looking more closely and reading in between the lines, I was unaware of the potentially catastrophic connection between hydraulic fracturing in a tornado-ridden state. The number of tornadoes in Illinois within the last 10 years has topped in at 674. However, the number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites has topped in at zero. This just doesn't seem right.... From a historic perspective, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is actually quite high. Although hydraulic fracturing is not known to cause tornadoes, tornadoes are certainly known to occur where these fracking sites will be in Southern Illinois. Thus, appropriate precautions must be taken. A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. This makes me wonder what would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornados has been found over 150 miles away. I can only imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water! Overall, this could lead to further complications. I am obviously no expert, but it seems to me that something needs to be done, starting with this problem being addressed within the proposed rules and regulations. From there, safety precautions should definitely be outlined and followed in the case of such an emergency such as a tornado touching down or barreling towards an area with fracking sites. Please consider this possible complication if a tornado were to cross paths with a frack site in Southern Illinois. Tornadoes are already very destructive, so what would happen if a frack site's destruction is added into the mix? Thanks for taking the time to read this concern of mine and please, please outline a way to ensure optimal safety of people and the environment in such an instance as this.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Before looking more closely and reading in between the lines, I was unaware of the potentially catastrophic connection between hydraulic fracturing in a tornado-ridden state. The number of tornadoes in Illinois within the last 10 years has topped in at 674. However, the number of draft regulations proposed by Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources describing safety measures regarding tornado strikes on fracking sites has topped in at zero. This just doesn't seem right.... From a historic perspective, the number and intensity of tornadoes in Illinois is actually quite high. Although hydraulic fracturing is not known to cause tornadoes, tornadoes are certainly known to occur where these fracking sites will be in Southern Illinois. Thus, appropriate precautions must be taken. A big swath of Washington, IL was flattened by a tornado on Sunday, 11/17/13. This makes me wonder what would have happened if this tornado had hit an area of the state covered in fracking sites? Debris from the tornados has been found over 150 miles away. I can only imagine if that debris had included "temporarily" stored flowback water or tanks filled with frack fluid or produced water! Overall, this could lead to further complications. I am obviously no expert, but it seems to me that something needs to be done, starting with this problem being addressed within the proposed rules and regulations. From there, safety precautions should definitely be outlined and followed in the case of such an emergency such as a tornado touching down or barreling towards an area with fracking sites. Please consider this possible complication if a tornado were to cross paths with a frack site in Southern Illinois. Tornadoes are already very destructive, so what would happen if a frack site's destruction is added into the mix? Thanks for taking the time to read this concern of mine and please, please outline a way to ensure optimal safety of people and the environment in such an instance as this.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Personally, I was at the Chicago hearing (held two days before Thanksgiving) on 11/26 and I did not have the opportunity to speak and voice any of my concerns along with not being able to address any of the inadequacies in the proposed rules and regulations. However, I did have the opportunity to hear other concerned, Illinois citizens voice their concerns, and without any response from the IDNR. At first, I did not realize that Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act required at least a general response to general questions asked and voiced during the hearings. This is completely unacceptable. Yes, those concerned with the process of hydraulic fracturing coming to Illinois (such as me!) can write comments, but although the IDNR is required to respond to each comment, I highly doubt that there is an entity supervising that and holding individuals accountable to respond to each comment. I guess the same is true for the public hearings, considering no questions were answered (as well as the fact that not all of us even got to directly make a comment to the IDNR during those hearings!). Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. I feel that the only remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period. Please consider this, as this was a violation, and thanks for your time in reading my concern with this (hopefully you did read this!)

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Personally, I was at the Chicago hearing (held two days before Thanksgiving) on 11/26 and I did not have the opportunity to speak and voice any of my concerns along with not being able to address any of the inadequacies in the proposed rules and regulations. However, I did have the opportunity to hear other concerned, Illinois citizens voice their concerns, and without any response from the IDNR. At first, I did not realize that Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act required at least a general response to general questions asked and voiced during the hearings. This is completely unacceptable. Yes, those concerned with the process of hydraulic fracturing coming to Illinois (such as me!) can write comments, but although the IDNR is required to respond to each comment, I highly doubt that there is an entity supervising that and holding individuals accountable to respond to each comment. I guess the same is true for the public hearings, considering no questions were answered (as well as the fact that not all of us even got to directly make a comment to the IDNR during those hearings!). Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. I feel that the only remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period. Please consider this, as this was a violation, and thanks for your time in reading my concern with this (hopefully you did read this!)

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Unavailability of Agency Representatives to Answer Questions at Public Hearings How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) This comment concerns the public hearings held by DNR on the Proposed Amendments to the Rules under the Oil and Gas Act and on the Proposed Rules under the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act. 37 Illinois Register 18081, 18081-82 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 18097, 18099 (November 15, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19746 (December 6, 2013); 37 Illinois Register 19747 (December 6, 2013). Comment: Section 5-40 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act provides as follows: At least one agency representative shall be present during the hearing who is qualified to respond to general questions from the public regarding the agency's proposal and the rulemaking process. 5 ILCS 100/5-40. At the public hearings in Chicago, (11/26/13), Ina (12/3/13), Effingham (12/16/13), Decatur (12/17/13) and Carbondale (12/19/13), DNR representatives were present on the panel, along with the hearing officer. However, at each of the hearings, the hearing officer made various statements that informed the citizens in attendance that the panel members would NOT answer questions. For example, the hearing officer stated that the DNR representatives were there to listen, that they would not respond to any comments, and that the hearing was not a question-and-answer session. Thus, because the agency officials were not available to answer general questions regarding the proposal and the rulemaking process, these public hearings were held in violation of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The remedy for these violations is either additional hearings in Chicago, Ina, Effingham, Decatur and Carbondale or, alternatively, a new First Notice with the opportunity for new public hearings and a new public comment period.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Way to go on the tornadoes. What me worry! Alfred E. Newman would be proud.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Whether working as an EMT or as a sergeant in the National Guard, safety of our people has always been of number one importance. No professional that I have ever worked with has been of the belief that accidents are not preventable. In fact, early on in basic training, I learned that all accidents are preventable, and safety precautions and rules must be put into place in order to protect those that work in hazardous conditions. Just because a person may work in hazardous areas does not mean that every reasonable effort to protect that person should not be put into place. Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Whether working as an EMT or as a sergeant in the National Guard, safety of our people has always been of number one importance. No professional that I have ever worked with has been of the belief that accidents are not preventable. In fact, early on in basic training, I learned that all accidents are preventable, and safety precautions and rules must be put into place in order to protect those that work in hazardous conditions. Just because a person may work in hazardous areas does not mean that every reasonable effort to protect that person should not be put into place. Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

With regards to worker safety, I'd like to direct you to the OSHA website, which states: From 2003 to 2010, 823 oil and gas extraction workers were killed on the job--a fatality rate seven times greater than the rate for all U.S. industries (Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries). This database also reports similar fatality rates since at least the early 1990s. Safety and health hazards and dangerous conditions that can result in fatalities for oil and gas workers include: Vehicle Accidents Struck-By/ Caught-In/ Caught-Between Explosions and Fires Falls Confined Spaces Chemical Exposures (<https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/oilgaswelldrilling/index.html>) Elsewhere on the site OSHA notes multiple health hazards associated with oil and gas drilling, including: Hydrogen Sulfide Silica Noise Diesel Particulate Matter Hazardous Chemicals Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM) Temperature Extremes Fatigue (<https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/oilgaswelldrilling/healthhazards.html>) There are also some helpful documents regarding silica and hydraulic fracturing. In a recent study of 116 samples from sites in Colorado, Texas, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, and Arkansas, OSHA discovered that: 47% showed silica exposures greater than the calculated OSHA PEL. 79% showed silica exposures greater than the NIOSH REL of 0.05 milligrams per cubic meter (mg/m³). 9% of all samples showed silica exposures 10 or more times the PEL, with one sample more than 25 times the PEL. 31% of all samples showed silica exposures 10 or more times the REL, with one sample more than 100 times the REL. (https://www.osha.gov/dts/hazardalerts/hydraulic_frac_hazard_alert.html) So it is clearly not uncommon for worker over-exposure to silica to occur in hydraulic fracturing sites. OSHA is very concerned about fracturing workers' exposure to silica for the following reasons: Hydraulic fracturing sand contains up to 99% silica. Breathing silica can cause silicosis. Silicosis is a lung disease where lung tissue around trapped silica particles reacts, causing inflammation and scarring and reducing the lungs' ability to take in oxygen. Workers who breathe silica day after day are at greater risk of developing silicosis. Silica can also cause lung cancer and has been linked to other diseases, such as tuberculosis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and kidney and autoimmune disease. (https://www.osha.gov/dts/hazardalerts/hydraulic_frac_hazard_alert.html) Clearly, the hazardous nature of the work should require that IDNR, which is charged with protecting the health and safety of the Illinois people and environment, to regulate worker safety. IDNR must require fracturing operators to adhere to OSHA regulations, particularly with regard to dust and radioactivity. IDNR must also develop rules that regulate all fracking operations to address the myriad of hazardous workplace conditions, including, but not limited to, any of the items listed above.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

You have a chance to alter the future for the better by putting more stringent regulations on fracking (or better yet seeking to halt it altogether). Seize this opportunity and let IDNR forever be remembered as standing on the right side of history in this battle. As not being afraid to stand up and make bold moves for what is right, despite pressure from the other side to stand down. Fracking is clearly a disaster waiting to happen. The alternatives have their faults as well, but we cannot wait or trust that the world will innovate our way out of the pending irreversible environmental damage to come as a result of fracking. Stand up, IDNR.

Sincerely, Kelsey Atkinson Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

You have a chance to alter the future for the better by putting more stringent regulations on fracking (or better yet seeking to halt it altogether). Seize this opportunity and let IDNR forever be remembered as standing on the right side of history in this battle. As not being afraid to stand up and make bold moves for what is right, despite pressure from the other side to stand down. Fracking is clearly a disaster waiting to happen. The alternatives have their faults as well, but we cannot wait or trust that the world will innovate our way out of the pending irreversible environmental damage to come as a result of fracking. Stand up, IDNR.

Sincerely, Kelsey Atkinson Evanston, IL 60202

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

You said you did not use science. Listed below are earthquakes in Illinois compiled by the U.S. Geological Survey. Your rules need to be entirely rewritten to include geological and other scientific concerns. We need a scientific and neutral body of experts. Please read below to see how endangered and how fragile Illinois is. Read below to see how endangered you and I are.

1838 Jun 9 14:45 5.2M Intensity VII Southern Illinois (38.5N 89.0W) Several catalogs place the epicenter of this earthquake near St. Louis, Mo., because of a report of a chimney being thrown down at St. Louis and because it was severely felt at St. Charles, Mo. Although reported effects do not support an intensity of VII, that intensity is assigned because of the similarity of the distribution of intensity to that of the earthquake of Oct. 8, 1857. Felt reports recorded at common points are one-half to one unit of intensity higher for the 1857 earthquake. Also felt in Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky.

1857 Oct 8 10:00 4.9M Intensity VII Southern Illinois (38.7N 89.2W) This severe earthquake was centered in the Mississippi River valley between St. Louis, Mo., and Centralia, Ill. At Centralia, the first of three reported shocks threw down chimneys; at St. Louis, it moved furniture, dislocated bricks, and felled plaster. The largest buildings rocked and articles fell from mantles. Reports indicate that the Mississippi River was in tumult. Felt in many towns in Illinois, along the Mississippi River south of Hannibal, Mo., in western Kentucky, and in parts of Indiana and Iowa.

1876 Sep 25 06:00 4.5M Intensity VI Wabash River Valley (Illinois) (38.5N 87.8W) (06:00 and 06:15) These earthquakes were felt most strongly between Friendsville and Mt. Carmel, Ill., and Evansville, Ind. They were described as heavy at Friendsville. The second shock threw down chimneys at Vincennes, Ind., alarmed residents at Evansville, Ind., and caused slight damage at Louisville and Owensboro, Ky. They were felt from St. Louis, Mo., to Indianapolis, Ind., and Louisville, Ky.

1876 Sep 25 06:15 4.8M Intensity VII Wabash River valley (Illinois) (38.5N 87.8W) See 1876 09 25 06:00.

1881 Jun 27 00:00 4.6M Intensity VI La Salle, Illinois (41.3N 89.1W) Before daybreak, a shock in the southwest part of La Salle, about 90 km northeast of Peoria, formed six parallel fissures that were traceable for 183 m in a northwest-southeast direction. Walls, foundations and furnaces in bottle and glass factories cracked in many places.

1882 Sep 27 10:20 4.4M Intensity VI Southern Illinois (39.0N 89.5W) A chimney was cracked severely at Greenfield, Green County, Ill., and a crack in the wall of a building was widened considerably at Salem, Marion County. People were awakened and small objects were displaced throughout the area. The felt area extended from Mexico, Mo., to Vincennes, Ind., and Henderson, Ky., in an east-west direction, and from Springfield to Pickneyville, Ill., in a north-south direction.

1883 Apr 12 08:36 Intensity VI Cairo, Illinois (37.0N 89.2W) A strong local earthquake rattled windows for 30 seconds and awakened everyone in Cairo, in southern Illinois near the Kentucky-Missouri border. People were injured slightly in the collapse of an old frame house.

1887 Aug 2 18:36 4.9M Intensity VI Southern Illinois (37.2N 88.5W) This severe shock broke windows at Cobden, Ill., cracked brick walls at Jonesboro, Ill., and Russellville, Ky., and loosened some plaster at Nashville, Tenn. Also felt in Indiana and Missouri and as far south as Huntsville, Ala.

1891 Sep 27 04:55 5.2M Intensity VII Near Mount Vernon, Illinois (38.250N 88.5W) Several chimneys were toppled at Mount Vernon, and the ceiling and sidewalls of the Methodist Church were damaged. Chimney damage also was reported at Browns and

Fair Economy Illinois

Nashville, Ill., and Cloverport, Ky. Plaster was knocked down at Jerseyville, Murphysboro, and Warsaw, Ill. Also felt in all or parts of Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, and Tennessee. 1903 Feb 9 00:21 4.9M Intensity VII Mississippi River Valley (Illinois) (37.8N 89.3W) This earthquake threw down chimneys in Jackson County at Grand Tower and Murphysboro, Ill., and damaged chimneys east of Murphysboro, at Carterville and Harrisburg, Ill. It was strongly felt from Jeffersonville, Mo. to Louisville, Ky., and from Cairo, Ill., to Hannibal, Mo. 1905 Aug 22 05:08 4.8M Intensity VI Southern Illinois (37.2N 89.3W) Chimneys were shaken down at Cairo, Pulaski County, Ill, and about 40 km southwest, at Sikeston, Mo. Chimneys also were broken or partly collapsed at nearby Charleston, Mo., and about 175 km southeast, at Clarksville, Tenn. The earthquake was felt most strongly along the Mississippi and Ohio River valleys, including parts of Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee. 1909 Jun 26 14:42 5.1M Intensity VII Aurora, Illinois (41.6N 88.1W) This earthquake has been related to the La Salle anticline in the Illinois Basin. Many chimneys fell, a stove overturned, and gas line connections broke at Aurora, west of Chicago. Several chimneys were downed at Forreston, Naperville, Streator, Triumph, and Troy Grove, and one fell at Waukegan. Brick walls cracked at Bloomington, and sidewalks cracked and many chimneys were damaged at Freeport. At Platteville, Wis., about 130 km northwest of Chicago, an old building was cracked; houses were jostled out of plumb at Beloit, Wis., about 240 km northwest of Chicago. Felt from Missouri to Michigan and Minnesota to Indiana. 1909 Jul 19 04:34 4.8M Intensity VII Between Havana and Petersburg, Illinois (40.2N 90.0W) Chimneys were demolished on more than 100 buildings in Menard County at Petersburg, northwest of Springfield. At a farm west of Petersburg, 20 windows broke and bricks pushed out above the doors. Fallen chimneys also were reported northwest of Springfield at Davenport, Iowa, and west of Springfield at Hannibal, Mo. Several newspaper articles describe this earthquake but do not report property damage. 1912 Jan 2 16:21 4.5M Intensity VI Near Aurora, Freeport, Morris, and Yorkville, Illinois? (41.5N 88.5W) The highest intensity was reported at those towns in Kane, Stephenson, Grundy, and Kendall Counties, respectively. Slight damage to chimneys was reported at Batavia and Geneva, Ill., north of Aurora, in Kane County. Two distinct shocks were observed at some places. The stronger shock also was felt in parts of Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky (Fulton County), and Wisconsin. 1917 Apr 9 20:52 5.1M Intensity VII Southern Illinois in the Mississippi River valley (38.1N 90.2W) At St. Louis, Mo., several chimneys were knocked down, windows were broken, and people were thrown to the pavement. At Granite City, Mo., buildings shifted on their foundations. At DeSoto, Mo., in Jefferson County, bricks fell from chimneys and the walls of several buildings were cracked. Many windows were broken and buildings rocked at Ste. Genevieve and St. Mary, Mo., south of St. Louis near the Illinois border. Heavy rumbling preceded and accompanied the earthquake in places. Felt from Kansas to Ohio and from Wisconsin to Mississippi. 1922 Mar 22 22:29 4.8M Intensity VII Southern Illinois (37.4N 89.4W) This strong earthquake knocked down 25 chimneys at Illmo, Scott County, Mo., and sent people rushing out of stores. Dishes fell from shelves at Carbondale, Ill. Also felt in Kentucky and Tennessee. 1922 Mar 23 02:22 4.6M Intensity VI Southern Illinois (37.4N 89.4W) At Illmo, Mo., south of Cape Girardeau in Scott County, the earthquake knocked down many more chimneys (see description of the main shock on Mar. 22, 1922). The shock was violent at Belleville, Ill., and severe at Jonesboro, Ill. Stovepipes were downed at Cape Girardeau, Mo., and people were knocked off their feet. Also felt at Evansville, Ind. 1922 Nov 27

Fair Economy Illinois

03:31 4.8M Intensity VII Near Eldorado, Illinois (37.8N 88.5W) The earthquake broke several windows and downed chimneys at Eldorado. One chimney flue was demolished and stovepipes fell at Harrisburg, 8 km southwest of Eldorado. Generally felt in southern Illinois, western Indiana, northern Kentucky, eastern Missouri, and western Tennessee. 1934 Nov 12 14:45 4.0M Intensity VI Near Rock Island, Illinois (41.5N 90.5W) In Rock Island and Moline, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, bricks fell from a few chimneys and pendulum clocks stopped. In Rock Island, a stucco cornice was dislodged from St. Joseph's School; some loose plaster was shaken from ceilings in the men's dormitory at Augustana College, and loose bricks were shaken from a few buildings. 1939 Nov 23 15:14 4.6M Intensity V Near Griggs, Illinois (38.180N 90.137W) [Listed without Summary in SUS. Summary from EHUS.] Intensity just short of damage. Affected area included most of Illinois, Missouri, and parts of Wisconsin, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Iowa. 1947 Jun 30 04:23 4.2M Intensity VI Waterloo-Dupo, Illinois, area, south of Saint Louis, Missouri (38.4N 90.2W) At St. Louis, several chimneys were toppled and a sidewalk was cracked. 1953 Sep 11 18:26 4.0M Intensity VI Southwest Illinois (38.8N 90.1W) At Roxana, north of East St. Louis, in Madison County, cracks formed in a concrete-block foundation and in plaster. Also felt in eastern Missouri. 1955 Apr 9 13:01 4.3M Intensity VI West of Sparta, Illinois (38.232N 89.785W) Concrete foundations and plaster walls were cracked at Evansville, Ill. (about 20 km west of Sparta), and at Lemay, University City, and Webster Groves, Mo. Also felt in Kentucky and Missouri. 1958 Nov 8 02:41 4.4M Intensity VI Southeast Illinois, near Indiana border (38.436N 88.8W) Plaster fell at Dale (Hamilton County) and Albion (Edwards County), and a basement wall cracked at Maunie (White County). Also felt in Indiana, Kentucky, and Missouri. 1965 Aug 14 13:13 3.4M Intensity VII Southwest Illinois (37.226N 89.307W) This strong local earthquake at Tamms (Alexander County) downed chimneys, cracked walls, muddied water, and knocked stock from shelves. 1968 Nov 9 17:01 5.2M Intensity VII Southern Illinois (37.911N 88.373W) This was the strongest felt earthquake in southern Illinois since the 1895 Missouri event. Property damage in the area consisted mainly of fallen bricks from chimneys, broken windows, toppled television aerials, and cracked or fallen plaster. In the epicentral area, near Dale, Hamilton County, MM intensity VII was characterized by downed chimneys, cracked foundations, overturned tombstones, and scattered instances of collapsed parapets. Most buildings that sustained damage to chimneys were 30 to 50 years old. A large twostory brick house near Dale, Ill., sustained several thousand dollars damage. About 10 km west of Dale, near Tuckers Corners, a concrete and brick cistern collapsed. A large amount of masonry damage occurred at the City Building at Henderson, Ky., 80 km east-southeast of the epicenter. Moderate damage to chimneys and walls occurred in several towns in southcentral Illinois, southwest Indiana, and northwest Kentucky. Felt over all or parts of 23 States: from southeast Minnesota to central Alabama and Georgia and from western North Carolina to central Kansas. People in multistory buildings in Boston, Mass. and southern Ontario, Canada, felt the earthquake. 1972 Sep 15 05:22 4.0M Intensity VI Northern Illinois (41.645N 89.369W) Cracks in chimneys, tombstones, elevated water tanks, and plaster occurred at Amboy (Lee County), south of Rockford. Chimney and plaster cracks were observed at Holcomb, northeast of Amboy, in Ogle County. Also felt in Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin. 1974 Apr 3 23:05 4.3M Intensity VI Southeast Illinois (38.549N 88.072W) Minor damage, generally in the form of cracked and broken chimneys, occurred in Wabash County. At West Salem, a few chimneys and

Fair Economy Illinois

tombstones were shaken down and other chimneys were damaged. Slight damage occurred at many towns in Indiana and Illinois. Also felt in Arkansas, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin. 1984 Jun 29 07:58 4.1M Intensity VI Southern Illinois (37.7N 88.470W) At Harrisburg, in Saline County, one house sustained structural damage. Also felt in western Kentucky and southeast Missouri. [The above summaries were abridged from Seismicity of the United States, 1568-1989 (Revised), by Carl W. Stover and Jerry L. Coffman, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1527, United States Government Printing Office, Washington: 1993 and from Preliminary Determinations of Epicenters Monthly Listing.] For a list of earthquakes that have occurred since this article was written, use the Earthquake Search.

Sincerely, Joyce Good Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Your lack of concern about fracking on/near earthquake zones absolutely boggles the mind. Don't you live on this planet? How can this not send shivers down your spine? Frack NOT on active seismic zones and flood plains. Simply put, do not permit it to happen.

Sincerely, Esther Allman 984 North Butternut Frankfort, IL 60423

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120)

Your recently published rules are wrong! Protect the people of Illinois, NOT big business. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is supposed to regulate the industry, not allow them to continue business as usual. Please reconsider the regulations put forth and stop fracking in Illinois now to protect our air, water, and climate.

Sincerely, Laurie Casey Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

- What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom.
- What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to long term public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dolores A. Rapp Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

- What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom.
- What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to long term public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dolores A. Rapp Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

- What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom.
- What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to long term public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dolores A. Rapp Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

- What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom.
- What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to long term public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, M. Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Any construction that is put into the ground around my home is clearly marked. For safety and health reasons, the city knows where different pipes lead to, what they contain, as well as the details of other hardware that are placed underground or built into the environment. This is important because these structures affect the entire community. Therefore, it is ridiculous that fracking companies are not explicitly required to provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore that they intend to drill under our shale and near our very water supply. Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270)245.200 Registration Procedures

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Any construction that is put into the ground around my home is clearly marked. For safety and health reasons, the city knows where different pipes lead to, what they contain, as well as the details of other hardware that are placed underground or built into the environment. This is important because these structures affect the entire community. Therefore, it is ridiculous that fracking companies are not explicitly required to provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore that they intend to drill under our shale and near our very water supply. Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270)245.200 Registration Procedures

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Dear Sirs, I am against ANY hydraulic fracking for the state of Illinois. I don't believe it is safe. I don't believe it will create jobs. I believe it will only poison our aquifers. The fact that the industry goes to such lengths to hide the chemical composition of the fluid they pump into these wells is especially damning. It is unconscionable to allow companies to pump undisclosed chemicals into the soil of our fair state. If our water is poisoned then it will be generations of Illinoisans living with the consequence. Pull this bill now. Do not issue ANY permits. I cannot emphasize enough how much I am against hydraulic fracking of ANY kind in this state. Regards, Christopher Kowalski

Sincerely, Christopher Kowalski 2343 N. Avers Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Directional Drilling Plan How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270)245.200 Registration Procedures This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Directional Drilling Plan How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270)245.200 Registration Procedures This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Directional Drilling Plan Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.200 Registration Procedures This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Directional Drilling Plan Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.200 Registration Procedures This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Due to the risks related to the water table and the waste products produced by fracking that require special storage. There needs to be stronger language in the guidelines that specifically define violations of all types. Because if something does happen, what are the regulatory penalties and who would have to pay for the cleanup? The legislature and the IDNR need to have stronger guidelines drawn because if this is allowed in the unique areas of the Shawnee National Forest or the Cache Wetlands, the damage might be so bad that cleanup will not be possible. Overall, the regulations should ban Fracking in any forms in Illinois.

Sincerely, Eric Jason Joliet, IL 60435

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Failure to address workplace rules or worker safety. Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.<http://www.dnr.illinois.gov/oilandgas/pages/onlinecommentssubmittalform.aspx>

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

For college students, any academic infringements committed by that student stay with that student for their entire collegiate life. The reasons behind this are that any mistakes can speak to that student's potential for future infringements. The same can be said about companies. If a company is willing to break a law and have a "serious" violation then it stands to reason that that company will be willing to break the law in the future, even if it is more than 5 years between infractions. This limitation is ridiculous. also, What constitutes a serious violation needs to be well defined or no company will willingly report having had a serious violation.

Sincerely, Brian Edward Anthony Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Fracking in Illinois? No way! This is a terrible idea that only creates jobs for 5-10 years and destroys our environment and natural resources for an indefinite amount of time. This is a horrible idea. Would you frack your grandma's backyard? Would you frack children's playgrounds? What direction should you drill? The answer is simple. Forget the drill. Invest in solar energy instead. It's renewable and doesn't ruin our soil and groundwater. This isn't even that difficult to understand.

Sincerely, Carlee Coplea 1122 W. Walkup Ave. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Fracking is a short term solution for the economy that will cause our environment long term problems. The environment is incredibly important to me as it should be for others because we all inhabit it, so I for one am against this idea. We need a clean environment more than we need money because at the end of all things, the environment is left and we and our money are not.

Sincerely, Wyatt Meyer Woodstock , IL 60098

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Fracking is a short term solution for the economy that will cause our environment long term problems. The environment is incredibly important to me as it should be for others because we all inhabit it, so I for one am against this idea. We need a clean environment more than we need money because at the end of all things, the environment is left and we and our money are not.

Sincerely, Wyatt Meyer Woodstock , IL 60098

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Healthcare workers and even people wishing to rent housing often have to submit to extensive background checks before given employment or even having their rental application approved. How is it that a fracking operator does not have to report any and all previous violations on their applications for fracking permits? Surely fracking operations, which have been demonstrated to use toxic chemicals and produce radioactive waste, have the potential to cause more harm to a greater number of people than someone attempting to rent an apartment, or even a healthcare provider? This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Healthcare workers and even people wishing to rent housing often have to submit to extensive background checks before given employment or even having their rental application approved. How is it that a fracking operator does not have to report any and all previous violations on their applications for fracking permits? Surely fracking operations, which have been demonstrated to use toxic chemicals and produce radioactive waste, have the potential to cause more harm to a greater number of people than someone attempting to rent an apartment, or even a healthcare provider? This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

I DO NOT WANT FRACKING IN ILLINOIS I THINK IT IS DANGEROUS

Sincerely, Sam Foskey Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

It is ridiculous to think that a giant fracking corporation would report any violations because they think they are "serious". They will all just say that they didn't think it was a big deal. And even if they do report it and you do decide to "punish" them, its only \$2,500. That is pocket change for the CEO let alone the entire company. Stop fracking now before you destroy the future of this state.

Sincerely, Jonathan Gerald Gill 120 Lawrence Woodstock, IL 60098

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

It is too obvious that the IDNR are faking concern for what has proven a devious industry. I would like each and every IDNR staff investigated for criminal intent to destroy our environment. The science is out there easily available to determine numerous disastrous effects of these vile corporation having spilled radiation hither and about carelessly poisoning streams, dumps and even reports this date still note what they were pawning off as cool for public dumps still being under quarantine at a public dump site ill suited for the radioactive material. I do not see that the IDNR is going to measure the deadly material on site or elsewhere nor deal with it other than thinking of injection sites causing earthquakes. The politicians who authorized this need their wallets examined. The IDNR staff need to be fired immediately with no unemployment benefits because they need placement in prison.

Sincerely, Glen Etzkorn 2375 Wing Hill Road Cobden, IL 62920-3506

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Please do more research on Fracking, my childrens future depends on your decisions

Sincerely, Andy Julian simpson, IL 62985

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Please do more research on Fracking, my childrens future depends on your decisions

Sincerely, Andy Julian simpson, IL 62985

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Re: 245.200 Registration Procedures This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” Because it's so difficult to define a "serious" violation, please require ALL violations to be reported regardless when it has occurred. Please prioritize human health in all policies.

Sincerely, Amanda Woodall 4949 N. Whipple Street Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Re: 245.200 Registration Procedures This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” Because it's so difficult to define a "serious" violation, please require ALL violations to be reported regardless when it has occurred. Please prioritize human health in all policies.

Sincerely, Amanda Woodall 4949 N. Whipple Street Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Re: 245.200 Registration Procedures This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” Because it's so difficult to define a "serious" violation, please require ALL violations to be reported regardless when it has occurred. Please prioritize human health in all policies.

Sincerely, Amanda Woodall 4949 N. Whipple Street Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Regulate our water to be clean. Oh wait, with fracking that is impossilbe.

Sincerely, Rachel Azzarello Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Regulate our water to be clean. Oh wait, with fracking that is impossilbe.

Sincerely, Rachel Azzarello Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.200 Registration Procedures A major flaw in this section of the rules is that the IDNR does not write out any guidelines for what counts as a 'serious violation' or 'equivalent' to disclose to the department. These guidelines need to be written out explicitly. Also, I would recommend for the department to require permit seekers to outline ALL violations in detail, as well as make this information available to the public. This way, there are more ways that Illinois residents including scientist and engineers can help in protecting our citizens from possible harm.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Slipshod work IDNR... you are doing a criminally negligent job of safeguarding the health and wellbeing of the citizens effected by these regulations. Failure to define serious violations is tantamount to allowing those applying for permits to decide the definition for themselves...we all know what happens when the fox guards the henhouse...slaughter.

Sincerely, Shelley Brown Decatur, IL 62522

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

The private landowner's right to waive the requirements of the regulations is threaded throughout the rules. For example, if property includes springs, wells, streams, rivers, lakes, ponds and/or reservoirs the owner may waive the required setbacks for drilling near these bodies of water. These setbacks by the way (300 or 500 ft) are not measured from the edge of a body of water but from its center – potentially allowing drilling very close to or within a large body of water.

Sincerely, Sigi Psimenos 1450 Plymouth Lane Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

The rule seems a bit self serving if it is up to the violator to determine what is a "serious" violation. A violation is a violation regardless of the time frame.

Sincerely, M Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

The rules of 245.200 Registration Procedures should require the applicants to disclose EVERY violation they have committed without limitation of time.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

The rules say that "Serious violation" means any violation set forth in 62 Ill. Adm. Code 240.140©. (Section 1-5 of the Act). What is the reason for 5-year time limitation included in the rules and the act? When tracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and ALLEGED violations should be considered when issuing a permit.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

The rules say that "Serious violation" means any violation set forth in 62 Ill. Adm. Code 240.140©. (Section 1-5 of the Act). What is the reason for 5-year time limitation included in the rules and the act? When tracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and ALLEGED violations should be considered when issuing a permit.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Jan A Pietrzak 12031 S 72nd Ct Palos Heights, IL 60463

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Lan R. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Avenue Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Lan R. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Avenue Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Lan R. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Avenue Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Sylvia Glauster 1327 E 52nd St #302 Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Sylvia Glauster 1327 E 52nd St #302 Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Tracy Noel 508 Pearl Marseilles, IL 61341

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment addresses inadequacies in two sections: Sections (245.210(a)(4)) Directional Drilling Plan and Section (245.210(a)(7)) Scaled plat maps, diagrams, or cross sections, These sections do not explicitly require that the applicant provide a map that depicts the exact location of the wellbore, i.e., draws it on the map from beginning to end. This information is critical to specific notice and standing, which reference persons within 750 feet of the wellbore. Revisions Needed: Require a map depicting the exact location of the wellbore.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This comment relates to 245.200 of the proposed regs. I believe this reg needs strengthening. Companies should be required to disclose all violations of laws and regulations relating to fracking, including proposed violations that are currently being contested by the company. There should be no time limit for when the violation occurred; the current 5 year time frame should be eliminated. Reporting should not be limited to violations that the company considers serious. All violations should be reported. Fracking violations can potentially seriously harm public health and safety, so in themselves must all be considered serious. Complete reporting as described above. Long term I believe states should work together to create a database that will capture fracking violations, so that states no longer have to rely on potentially flawed self reporting in assessing the violation history of a company interested in obtaining a fracking permit.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn't report a violation because “we didn't think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn't report a violation because “we didn't think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn't report a violation because “we didn't think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Andrew Hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Andrew Hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagione Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Dylan Busser Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty 5122 S. University Ave 1S Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Janet Elizabeth Donoghue 5082 Springer Ridge Rd Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred. There should be NO GRAY area - - simple black and white - - either they violated or they did not...that's it.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred. There should be NO GRAY area - - simple black and white - - either they violated or they did not...that's it.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred. There should be NO GRAY area - - simple black and white - - either they violated or they did not...that's it.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Mike Reed Box 421 Sheridan, IL 60551

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Mike Reed Box 421 Sheridan, IL 60551

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Mike Reed Box 421 Sheridan, IL 60551

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Miranda Bailey 1822 Park Ave Alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Miranda Bailey 1822 Park Ave Alton, IL 62002

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Nancy Eichelberger 8405 S Ridge Rd Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Nancy Eichelberger 8405 S Ridge Rd Plainfield, IL 60544

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, TX 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rachele Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Robert Yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra University of Chicago (5630 S. University Avenue) Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” - What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. - What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department “all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years.” What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because “we didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

To whom it may concern, my name is Eleanor Larsen and I am writing on behalf of the public and the natural environment. I have read the guidelines released by the IDNR and I find them to be completely inadequately developed to regulate a very hazardous industrial endeavor. Hydraulic fracturing is extremely dangerous and we need to take all precautions possible to mitigate the possibilities of commercial exploitation. In section 245.200 Registration Procedures, I am thoroughly dissatisfied with your failure to define the term "serious violation". The statement is vague and weak, and full of exploitive potential. You have proposed a superficial screening mandate that only acknowledges violations as defined by the indefinite term "serious". Applicants need to disclose any and all violations if they desire a permit. This includes the full history of violations of any degree committed by the applicant. The qualification of "the previous five years" is useless, arbitrary and also full of exploitive potential. We would appreciate it if the IDNR would operate out of concern for the citizens of Chicago and Illinois in the future. We are not impressed by the way you have collapsed under the pressure of the oil industry in drafting these regulations. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely, Eleanor Larsen Chicago, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Today's fracking comment to the IDNR. Imagine 20 hour shifts for workers and a fatality rate over 7 times the industry rate. Not only does this jeopardize the workers safety, but also all of ours. I know it's Christmas, but how about giving yourself the gift of a frack free world. Feel free to cut, paste and send to the link below..... Failure to address workplace rules or worker safety. Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart A: General Provisions (245.100-245.120) Problems: The fatality rate of gas and oilfield workers is 7.6 times above all other industries and set an all-time high record in 2012 (King 2013). An inescapably dangerous work setting under the best of circumstances, frack pads are rendered even more dangerous by well operators who eschew workplace safety standards and who force employees to work excessively and dangerously long hours. Sixteen (16) to 20 hour work shifts can be scheduled with the end result that exhausted workers make mistakes in an unforgiving environment or fall asleep behind the wheel of a vehicle, often claiming their own lives and the lives of residents who happen to be on the wrong road at the wrong time (Urbina 2012). There are at least two work related dangers at frack pads that should fall under OSHA regulations: exposure to (1) radiation and (2) silica dust. Both can increase rates of cancer among exposed workers and both kinds of work-site related exposure are limited and regulated by OSHA. Yet, the oil and gas industry have found an easy way to escape regulation: simply don't test for work place exposure. Since there are no data on exposure, OSHA cannot step in and demand workplace fixes. Revisions needed: IDNR must require fracking operators to adhere to OSHA rule and regulations, especially regarding dust and radioactivity. IDNR must develop rules which recognize and regulate non-union frack operations to address inherently dangerous workplace conditions, including but not limited to work shifts, working conditions, and truck transportation to and from operations.<http://www.dnr.illinois.gov/oilandgas/pages/onlinecommentssubmittalform.aspx>

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Tracking borings is essential to regulation.

Sincerely, Mark Grotzke 18136 South Rita Road #2A Tinley Park, IL 60477

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

Tracking borings is essential to regulation.

Sincerely, Mark Grotzke 18136 South Rita Road #2A Tinley Park, IL 60477

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What constitutes a "serious" violation Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.200 Registration Procedures This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department "all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years." What does IDNR define as a "serious" violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn't report a violation because "we didn't think it was serious." Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What constitutes a "serious" violation Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.200 Registration Procedures This section of the rules states that every applicant applying for a permit must disclose to the Department "all findings of a serious violation or an equivalent violation under federal, Illinois or other state laws or regulations in the development or operation of an oil or gas exploration or production site via hydraulic fracturing by the registrant or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the registrant within the previous 5 years." What does IDNR define as a "serious" violation? There is no guideline here making it easy for violators to claim that they didn't report a violation because "we didn't think it was serious." Instead, applicants should be required to disclose ALL violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What constitutes a serious violation? I would say any violation that's not reported in the FIRST PLACE. Is there a so called "fine" for not reporting violations from the get go? Who will be doing the. Investigations on grounds. The truth is the companies in violation of these rules are most likely habitual offenders. The 5 year disclosure limit, along with the low fines potentially allows these repeat violators to operate for years. The side effects of these operations will began about the time they no longer even have to disclose it? Is this correct? Obviously these MINING operations are very lucrative, they wouldn't be there if it wasn't. At the very least the local county legislation should make it as hard as possible to obtain these permits, instead it seems they're giving the green light. No mystery that companies have already brought irreversible environmental changes to the Heritage Corridor, the I&M canal trail area, Illinois River, and countless other places along the waterways over the century, But sand mining/fracking may be the one that does us in.

Sincerely, John hunt 3219 n. Karlov apt. G Chicago, IL 60641

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What does IDNR define as a “serious” violation? There is no guideline, making it easy for violators to claim that they didn’t report a violation because they “didn’t think it was serious.” Instead, applicants should be required to disclose all violations alleged by public authorities and any fines or findings therefrom. Also, what is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Michael Lang Peoria, IL 61606

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What is considered to be a serious violation? Does this mean that the violators are to report on themselves, if they think they have caused a threat to public safety? Do they wait five years to make this report? During those five years, what changes would they be called on to make? If none are called for, what happens to the safety and health of the people in the area for FIVE years?

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What is considered to be a serious violation? Does this mean that the violators are to report on themselves, if they think they have caused a threat to public safety? Do they wait five years to make this report? During those five years, what changes would they be called on to make? If none are called for, what happens to the safety and health of the people in the area for FIVE years?

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What is considered to be a serious violation? Does this mean that the violators are to report on themselves, if they think they have caused a threat to public safety? Do they wait five years to make this report? During those five years, what changes would they be called on to make? If none are called for, what happens to the safety and health of the people in the area for FIVE years?

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.200 Registration Procedures

What is the reason for the 5 year time limitation? When fracking violations potentially pose a threat to public health and safety, all previous violations and alleged violations should be considered when issuing a permit, regardless of how long ago they occurred.

Sincerely, Lauren Keeling Chicago, IL 60614

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

"When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

"When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

"When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

"When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

"When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty 5122 S. University Ave 1S Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

A significant number of residents are under the protection of county residents and should retain the same protection as those who reside in cities or municipalities. This needs to be addressed and permits issued only when approval is received from local county government.

Sincerely, Natalie Sutton 2202 Melanie Lane Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

A significant number of residents are under the protection of county residents and should retain the same protection as those who reside in cities or municipalities. This needs to be addressed and permits issued only when approval is received from local county government.

Sincerely, Natalie Sutton 2202 Melanie Lane Marion, IL 62959

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Chemical Disclosure Report: Unclear Standards for the Exercise of Discretion by IDNR Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.210 Permit Application Requirements Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Chemical Disclosure Report: Unclear Standards for the Exercise of Discretion by IDNR Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.210 Permit Application Requirements Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Comments ON IDNR Rules Regarding The Hydrolic Fracturing Of Shale Deposits In Illinois By: Doug Nicodemus 928 E. Adams Riverton IL 62561 dougmic55@yahoo.com or 217.629.7031 The flaring of natural gases that will result from drilling shale wells in Illinois should be prohibited. These natural gases are a valuable fuel source for the generation of electricity in Illinois and should be used for the benefit of its citizens who give up their sovereign rights to those who extract their resources. In addition, natural gases are a very potent green house gas and as such contribute to global warming much more (5 to 20 times more) than carbon dioxide and as such any release of methane should be prohibited at shale drilling and production sites.

Sincerely, Doug Nicodemus 948 E. Adams Riverton, IL 62561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Comments ON IDNR Rules Regarding The Hydrolic Fracturing Of Shale Deposits In Illinois By: Doug Nicodemus 928 E. Adams Riverton IL 62561 dougmic55@yahoo.com or 217.629.7031 The flaring of natural gases that will result from drilling shale wells in Illinois should be prohibited. These natural gases are a valuable fuel source for the generation of electricity in Illinois and should be used for the benefit of its citizens who give up their sovereign rights to those who extract their resources. In addition, natural gases are a very potent green house gas and as such contribute to global warming much more (5 to 20 times more) than carbon dioxide and as such any release of methane should be prohibited at shale drilling and production sites.

Sincerely, Doug Nicodemus 948 E. Adams Riverton, IL 62561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Comments ON IDNR Rules Regarding The Hydrolic Fracturing Of Shale Deposits In Illinois By: Doug Nicodemus 928 E. Adams Riverton IL 62561 dougmic55@yahoo.com or 217.629.7031 The flaring of natural gases that will result from drilling shale wells in Illinois should be prohibited. These natural gases are a valuable fuel source for the generation of electricity in Illinois and should be used for the benefit of its citizens who give up their sovereign rights to those who extract their resources. In addition, natural gases are a very potent green house gas and as such contribute to global warming much more (5 to 20 times more) than carbon dioxide and as such any release of methane should be prohibited at shale drilling and production sites.

Sincerely, Doug Nicodemus 948 E. Adams Riverton, IL 62561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Comments ON IDNR Rules Regarding The Hydrolic Fracturing Of Shale Deposits In Illinois By: Doug Nicodemus 928 E. Adams Riverton IL 62561 dougmic55@yahoo.com or 217.629.7031 The flaring of natural gases that will result from drilling shale wells in Illinois should be prohibited. These natural gases are a valuable fuel source for the generation of electricity in Illinois and should be used for the benefit of its citizens who give up their sovereign rights to those who extract their resources. In addition, natural gases are a very potent green house gas and as such contribute to global warming much more(5 to 20 times more) than carbon dioxide and as such any release of methane should be prohibited at shale drilling and production sites.

Sincerely, Doug Nicodemus 948 E. Adams Riverton, IL 62561

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

From the rules: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? - The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. - This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? - There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. - Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. - There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Andrew Hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

From the rules: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? - The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. - This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? - There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. - Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. - There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, TX 75075

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

From the rules: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? - The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. - This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? - There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. - Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. - There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

From the rules: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? - The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. - This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? - There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. - Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. - There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan 5454 S Ingleside Ave Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

From the rules: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? - The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. - This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? - There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. - Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. - There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra University of Chicago (5630 S. University Avenue) Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

From the rules: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? - The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. - This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? - There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. - Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. - There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra University of Chicago (5630 S. University Avenue) Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

From the rules: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? - The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. - This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? - There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. - Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. - There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Hi folks, I live in rural Pope County and would appreciate the same consideration that towns, cities and other entities are getting. Seems to me the most vulnerable areas would be the larger acreage located in rural area, this the need to inform the counties would only make sense and add fairness to the process. Please keep the environment, the water and our quality of life number one...

Sincerely, Richard Marose Pope County Illinois

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Hi folks, I live in rural Pope County and would appreciate the same consideration that towns, cities and other entities are getting. Seems to me the most vulnerable areas would be the larger acreage located in rural area, this the need to inform the counties would only make sense and add fairness to the process. Please keep the environment, the water and our quality of life number one...

Sincerely, Richard Marose Pope County Illinois

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

I work for a small municipal Water District in Southern Illinois. I take seven samples from various locations to an EPA lab once a month, and I am extremely concerned about what fracking will do to the quality of the drinking water. It could contaminate our clean water system and put the health of the public at risk. I am also concerned about the amount of water used in the fracking process. The amount of water used for fracking one well is almost as much as our total monthly output; using so much water will result in not having an adequate water supply for the people. These are my main concerns. They lie with: the water consumers, the landowners and their specific rights, and the long-term impacts left on this region. Thank you for your time. Erica

Sincerely, Erica Medley Grantsburg, IL 62943

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

I work for a small municipal Water District in Southern Illinois. I take seven samples from various locations to an EPA lab once a month, and I am extremely concerned about what fracking will do to the quality of the drinking water. It could contaminate our clean water system and put the health of the public at risk. I am also concerned about the amount of water used in the fracking process. The amount of water used for fracking one well is almost as much as our total monthly output; using so much water will result in not having an adequate water supply for the people. These are my main concerns. They lie with: the water consumers, the landowners and their specific rights, and the long-term impacts left on this region. Thank you for your time. Erica

Sincerely, Erica Medley Grantsburg, IL 62943

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

IDNR identifies the definition of an "Affected patient" as "a person receiving health care services from a health professional for an illness or injury diagnosed by the health professional to be caused by exposure to any chemicals used in high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations that are subject to a claim of trade secret by a permittee or contractor." This definition is circular: in order to learn what chemical was used, a physician must first test for it so he can prove he has a right to disclosure of the proprietary chemical. How can a doctor diagnose exposure to a secret chemical used in high volume fracking before he knows which chemicals to test for? IDNR needs to grant immediate access to these lists of chemicals to health professionals.

Sincerely, Grace Pai 1350 E. 53rd St. Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

IDNR NEEDS to address our unique condition here in Illinois. These rules are too ambiguous and have way too many loopholes. We needs stricter rules. Extreme weather takes place in Illinois, yet there are no regulations for how cleanup will be handled if there is a tornado.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

IDNR NEEDS to address our unique condition here in Illinois. These rules are too ambiguous and have way too many loopholes. We needs stricter rules. Extreme weather takes place in Illinois, yet there are no regulations for how cleanup will be handled if there is a tornado.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought - exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus 1806 Marion Ct Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Local Control How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.210 Permit Application Requirements When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? I live in a county area, where I have a postal address of a town that I can't vote in, I vote in a village that doesn't effectively circulate the decision-making of its village officers, my water district extends into adjacent counties, as does my electric utility provider. The hydraulic fracturing industry could impact any and all of these units. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Local Control How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.210 Permit Application Requirements When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? I live in a county area, where I have a postal address of a town that I can't vote in, I vote in a village that doesn't effectively circulate the decision-making of its village officers, my water district extends into adjacent counties, as does my electric utility provider. The hydraulic fracturing industry could impact any and all of these units. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: IDNR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: IDNR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: IDNR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted [...]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605